

E 866

SEX HOSTILITY IN MARRIAGE
ITS ORIGIN, PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

“True marriage is not the marriage
without differences, but the marriage in
which these differences are invariably
reconciled.”

J. G. WATTJES.

(“Philosophical Thoughts on Marriage.”)

WORKS BY
DR. TH. H. VAN DE VELDE

IDEAL MARRIAGE

Its Physiology and Technique
8 Plates.

Demy 8vo. 350 pages. 25s. net.

**SEX HOSTILITY IN
MARRIAGE**

Its Origin, Prevention and Treatment
43 Illustrations.

Demy 8vo. 300 pages. 17s. 6d. net.

**FERTILITY AND STERILITY
IN MARRIAGE**

*Their Voluntary Promotion and
Limitation*
20 Plates.


Demy 8vo. 450 pages. 25s. net.

**SEX EFFICIENCY THROUGH
EXERCISES**

Special Physical Culture for Woman
With 500 Cinematographic and about 50
other Illustrations.

350 pages. About 12s. 6d. net.
(In Press.)

WM. HEINEMANN (MEDICAL BOOKS) LTD.
99, GREAT RUSSELL ST., LONDON, W.C. 1



NAWAB SALAMAT JUNG BAHADUR.

Th. H. Vandervelde

SEX HOSTILITY IN MARRIAGE

ITS ORIGIN, PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

TH. H. VAN DE VELDE

AUTHOR OF "IDEAL MARRIAGE," "FERTILITY AND STERILITY IN MARRIAGE," ETC.

TRANSLATED BY

HAMILTON MARR, M.A. (Cantab.)



LONDON

**WILLIAM HEINEMANN
(MEDICAL BOOKS) LTD.**

1931

DEDICATED TO
A MOTHERLY FRIEND

"The man who has experienced such a friendship
will be grateful for it all his life."

CH. III.

PREFACE

I SHOULD like to precede this, the second volume of my trilogy on married happiness, with a word of explanation.

And first, I must apologise for the personal nature of this explanation, for if the purpose of the book is to be understood, such a course is inevitable.

This purpose then is *not* to add to the number of more or less philosophic studies of the "general psychology of marriage," for I am neither a psychologist nor a philosopher by profession ; and further, I am not convinced that any such treatment of the subject would help those for whom I write.

Neither is it my intention to advise, in a contribution to special psychology, those persons who have become nervously diseased in marriage (sometimes, too, as a result of marriage) how to treat their cases. I have never been a nerve specialist nor a psychiatrist, and I belong to no particular school in such matters. Further, I am convinced that a diseased person should not attempt to obtain help from reading a book such as this. Only treatment suitable for himself as an individual and adapted to his particular case, can be of any assistance.

What then is my purpose in writing this work ? To help those numerous people, whose happiness is menaced by the spectre of hostility in marriage to combat this danger. I am a physician in thought and sentiment, and as such it is my duty to try to help wherever possible. If the physician cannot do this actively or through the spoken word, he must choose the medium of the pen.

I am convinced that in this case a book may be of real help. Few married couples are aware of the evil and dangerous enemy that stands so near to them. Most of them only know of his *existence* after he has been victorious. Nevertheless, broadly speaking, this enemy menaces every marriage at a certain period. In many cases he renews his

attacks after a period of inactivity, and he is thus only too often successful in destroying the happiness of a marriage. Now an enemy, whoever he may be, can never be combated with any prospects of success if his opponents have no idea of his nature or of his power, and still less if, indeed, they are unaware of his presence and do not even know of his existence.

It is therefore necessary to endeavour to maintain the happiness of marriage not only by strengthening the power that attracts husband and wife to one another (that power to which I dedicated the first volume of this trilogy, "Ideal Marriage"), but also by fighting those repelling forces (by enunciating and explaining them) that threaten the happiness of a marriage. This book will contribute to that end. It will demonstrate the interplay of mental processes which, as far as inner experience is concerned, take place partly in certain portions of the conscious mind, but more particularly in the outlying spheres of the near-conscious. These processes, as far as men's relations to the outside world are concerned, are subjected not only to influences we know of, but also to many factors that are to a great extent still unknown. We must therefore treat not only of feelings and effects that are more or less obvious, but in addition, we must explore regions where unexplained forces and hidden movements hold sway.

I cannot and shall not attempt to *penetrate* into those sciences that treat of so many and various subjects.

Further, this is not necessary for men and women who are trying to preserve their marriages from the decay threatening them.

What they lack is *insight*, an *understanding* of the things in question.

The purpose of the book is to give this insight.

It will contain as much as possible of what I have learned after many years' study of the subject, and have worked out from a varied objective and subjective experience of life, finally condensing and welding into a complete whole.

Experts should remember that this is not a work for specialists. Further, that I do not intend to treat of married

happiness and its maintenance from *the* psychological side, but from *one* psychological side only, one of the many sides, nevertheless, that up to the present time has not been dealt with, or, at any rate, not to the extent its importance deserves.

On the other hand, I hope and trust that the general public, to whom this work is addressed—I include here not only married people of both sexes, but also their family physicians and mental and spiritual advisers—will be helped by this book in their attempts successfully to combat many of those dangers that threaten the happiness of marriage.

TH. H. VAN DE VELDE.

VAL FONTILE,
MINUSIO-LOCARNO,
SWITZERLAND.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	V
FIRST SECTION	
THE ORIGIN OF HOSTILITY IN MARRIAGE	I
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION	I
CHAPTER II	
PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SEXUAL AVERSION	6
Clinical Examination of the Case of Henry von B.	6
The Married Couple considered as Patients	7
Law of the Ambivalence of Emotion	8
Is there <i>original</i> Sexual Antagonism ?	9
What the Sociology of Animals teaches us	10
Secondary Sexual Antagonism	13
Hatred of Men in " Old Maids "	14
Antagonism towards the Opposite Sex in Youth	15
Reversal of the Impulse of Approach	15
Shy Reserve in the Initial Stages of Love	16
Its Purpose and Significance.	16
Reversal of Sexual Feelings in the Sexually Unsatisfied Married Woman	16
Sublimation of Emotion	17
Reversal in the Man whose Wife fails him	17
Hostility resulting from Reversal owing to Clumsy Defloration. Vaginismus for the same reason in Women mentally predisposed thereto	18 19
Reversal due to Satiety (temporary)	19
<i>Primary Essential Hostility (continuation)</i>	20
Observations among Primitive Peoples	20
In Children	21
Curious Features of the Memory	21
Symptoms of Repression in Certain Cases	21
Sexual Antagonism associated with these Symptoms	21
Cases, in which Primary Repulsion (in the man) is Stronger than the Sexual Impulse	22
Primary Aversion (in the woman) and Feeling of Modesty	22
Significance of the Individual Disposition	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Connection with the Internal and External Secretions of the Sex Glands	23
Discussion of the Problems associated with the Ambivalence of Sexual Antagonism	23
Primary Essential Aversion and Desire for Satisfaction (Desire for Evacuation)	23
Impulse of Approach and Secondary Antagonism	24
Practical Conclusions	26
Genital Antagonism	27
Sexual Impulse and Erotic Hostility	28

CHAPTER III

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MASCULINE AND FEMININE.

FIRST PART	29
<i>Typical Differences. Masculine Characteristics</i>	29
The Polar Contrast between Masculine and Feminine	30
The Characteristic Difference between the Seminal Cell and the Ovum is found again in Man and Woman	31
Man and Woman are of Equal Importance, but not of the same Nature	32
Kinetic Energy in the Man, Potential Energy in the Woman	33
Typical Masculine Qualities.	33
Aggressiveness	33
Sexual Motives	34
Will to Power	34
It is a Natural Necessity for the man to Strive to perfect his Qualities	35
His need to Concentrate his Mental Powers on Work	35
Advantages of this Main Quality : Capability of Mental Concentration, of Reasoned, Logical Thought and of Objective Judgment ; Self-control and Will-power	35
Disadvantages of the above-mentioned Main Qualities ; Danger of losing Himself in his Work ; Repression of Erotic Feelings, Neglect of his Wife ; Restriction of the Secondary Cerebral Function.	36
Explanation of the ideas " Conscious " and " Unconscious "	36
Importance of the Primary and Secondary Cerebral Function.	36
Industry and Ambition	37
Egocentricity	39
Feeling of Loneliness	40

CHAPTER IV

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MASCULINE AND FEMININE.

SECOND PART	41
<i>Feminine Characteristics. Emotional Capacity</i>	41
Constriction of the Conscious Mind and Expansion of the Sub-conscious Mind, Tact, Intuition, Suggestibility, Activity, Variability, Changing Moods, Love of Variety	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
Need to be Amused	51
Boredom	52

CHAPTER V

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MASCULINE AND FEMININE.

SECOND PART	54
<i>Feminine Characteristics (continuation). Vulnerability and Plasticity</i>	54
Vulnerability innate in the Woman	55
Fluctuating Equilibrium of the Processes of Life	57
Consequences of on the Psyche	58
" Inferiority Complex "	59
Resentment	60
Struggle for Power	61
Neurotic Repercussions, seeking Protection	62
Material for a " Psychological Tragedy of the Woman "	65
Grudge against the Man who allows himself to be Conquered	67

CHAPTER VI

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MASCULINE AND FEMININE.

SECOND PART	68
<i>Feminine Characteristics (continuation). Maternal Instinct</i>	68
Biological and Natural Necessity	69
The Maternal Instinct is the most Important Expression of the Potential Energy of the Feminine.	69
Outlets for Childless Women	71
Sublimation	73
Repression or Suppression of Emotions	74
Motherhood apparently Discredited	76
Alterocentricity a Main Quality of the Woman	78

CHAPTER VII

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MASCULINE AND FEMININE.

THIRD PART	80
<i>Sexual Physiological Differences and their Psychological Significance</i>	80
The Relative Ages of the Married Pair	81
The Woman's greater Sexual Capacity	81
Sexual Frigidity in Man and Woman	83
Homo-sexuality	84
Impotence	85
Physiological Frigidity in the Woman as a Cause of Hostility.	86
Man and Woman have their own Normals	87
The Difference in the Significance of the Act for both Sexes	88
The so-called " Double Morality " is not based on Masculine Autocracy, but is the result of Biological and Physiological Facts.	91

	PAGE
CHAPTER VIII	
FROM SPECIFIC AVERSION TO ANTAGONISM IN MARRIAGE	93
Attracting and Repelling Forces in the Relationships between the Sexes	93
Masculine and Feminine Entities	94
Impossibility of a real Mutual Understanding	95
Mitigation of the Contrast owing to Normal Bi-sexual Constitution	95
Masculinisation and Feminine Reconversion	97
Relationship between the Sexes	99
Infidelity	102
Jealousy	104
Hysteria	105
Children as a Cause of Married Hostility.	109
Tendency in the Man to remodel his Wife after his Mother or Himself	110
Idealistic Exaggerations	111
Long engagements	112
Danger of disregarding the Æsthetic Side of Marriage	115
Struggle for Power, Laws of Group Psychology	118
Natural Fading of Love as a Cause of Married Hostility	119
Reference to the Case quoted in the Introduction.	120
Another instance of Exaggerated Idealism	121
Eros-Thanatos	122
The Man must Return to his Work, the Woman to her Children	123
Influence of Other Factors	124
Intermezzo	125

SECOND SECTION

PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

CHAPTER IX	
INTRODUCTION. APOLOGIA OF MARRIAGE	130
<i>Man and Woman's Responsibilities</i>	130
Prevention premises Understanding	130
Marriage should not be Condemned because of the Certainty of Married Hostility	134
Marriage alone makes possible the Combined Satisfaction of Gregarious Instinct and Sexual Impulse	136
Men's Personal Need and Desire for Marriage.	137
Marriage as a Union of a Higher Nature.	139
Security offered by Marriage	141
Woman has more Interest in and a Greater Talent for Marriage	141
Responsibility and Inadequacy of Man and Woman	142

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xiii

PAGE

CHAPTER X

THE CHOICE OF A PARTNER. PART ONE	146
<i>Love and Common Sense</i>	146
Selection by the Parents	147
Opposition of Young People to this	147
Intuitive Love	149
Choice is sometimes only Apparent	150
Nature looks after the Welfare of the Species rather than the Happiness of the Individual	150
Optimistic and Pessimistic Points of View	151
Where Reason is Lacking in the Planning of a Marriage, this Defect must be made up for Ten Times in the Marriage	153
Eros can be guided well enough at First	154
The Primary Cerebral Function must Control the Secondary in the Marriage Choice	155

CHAPTER XI

THE CHOICE OF A PARTNER. PART TWO	156
<i>The Circumstances</i>	156
In Selection in Marriage account should (or ought) be taken of the Circumstances, Health, Disposition and Character	157
Financial Circumstances	158
Women and a Profession	161
Husband and Wife Working Together	164
Training the Woman	165
The Man's Profession and Marriage	171
Attitude to Life and Marriage	172
An Attitude to Life based on Work is Difficult to combine with One based on Pleasure	174
Like to Like with reference to Religion, Race, Class, Attitude to Life and Children	176
Importance of Heredity and Family Ties in Contracting a Marriage	178

CHAPTER XII

THE CHOICE OF A PARTNER. PART THREE	181
<i>Health</i>	181
Subject only Dealt with in Detail here in regard to Certain Problems	182
Health of the Sexual Organs	182
Remains and Consequences of Previous Inflammation	183
Infantilism in Girls of Syphilitic Fathers	184
Significance of Pelvic Abnormalities	186
Exchange of Health Certificates	190

CHAPTER XIII

THE CHOICE OF A PARTNER. PART FOUR	191
<i>The Character</i>	191
Self-knowledge	191
Revival of Characterology	192
Summary of Works relating to this	193
Definition of What is Meant by Character	194
Recognition of the Character	195
Direct and Indirect Methods	196
Conformation of the Body and Character an Expression of the Constitution	197
What is meant by Constitution	198
Cyclothyme and Schizothyme	203, 204
Physical Types	205
Pycnic and Leptosome ; Athletic and Asthenic	208, 211
Examples	212
Types of Constitution in Art and Fashion	216
The Constitutional Types in Man and Woman	218
The Pycnic-cyclothyme Woman and the " Inter-sexual "	225
Dysplastic Types and Transitional Types	226
Selection in Marriage and the Constitutional Type	227
Prospects in Marriage of the Representatives of the Main Types	228
Physiognomy	231
Movements of Expression and Character	232
<i>Graphology</i>	233
Its Significance	234
Demands as to how it should be Practised	235
Value of Study of a good Graphological Analysis	236
Certain Traits of Character and Marriage	239
Defects of Character and Morbid Disturbances	242
<i>Appendix</i>	243
Example of a Graphological Analysis with Reference to Marriage	245

CHAPTER XIV

INSIGHT AND ADAPTABILITY	251
Necessary Limitation of Book	251
Principal Object, to give <i>Insight</i>	252
Even those who are Married, if they wish to gain this, should study what has been said regarding Selection in Marriage	253
Most people lack both Insight into the Whole Idea of Marriage as also into their own Egos and those of their Partners	253
Intuitive Insight	254
Natural Talent for Marriage	254
Talent gained by Insight	255
Marriage as a Life Union	256
Extremely Deleterious Effect of Thinking about Divorce	256

TABLE OF CONTENTS

XV

	PAGE
A Married Relationship, in which the Woman allows herself to be guided by her Husband, is in Harmony both with the Nature of the Man and of the Woman	257
The Woman is Fortunate who can Believe in her Husband	258
If the Man lacks the necessary Qualities for this, the Woman's "Behaviour as-if" may work Wonders sometimes	259
Feminism and Marriage	260
Heræism	261
Lack of Control in Men	262
Issue and Marriage	263
Efforts to understand one another as far as possible	265
Adaptability to the Claims made by Marriage	266
Adaptability to the Nature of the Partner	267
Love (in the sense of Love of One's Neighbour)	267

CHAPTER XV

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRACTICAL EROTIC KNOWLEDGE IN MARRIAGE	268
Love of One's Neighbour is an Adjustment between Repelling Forces	268
Love in the Sexual Sense is the great Attractive Force	268
Lack of Erotic Love in Marriage a Source of Hostility	269
A nearly perfect Erotic Technique prevents many Neurotic Disturbances	269
Gives People the opportunity of satisfying in the Marriage from time to time their need for Excess	270
Importance of the Natural Moral Code.	270
Erotics in Marriage and Satisfaction of Feminine Emotional Capacity	270
"Ideal Marriage" guards the Woman against any Thoughts of Infidelity	271
It is also the most Effective Means of preventing Infidelity in the Man	271
Love is more Powerful than Duty	273
Erotic Tension must be maintained in the Marriage	274
Only on this Condition is the Perfect Erotic Technique of "Ideal Marriage" the Means of continually renewing the Marriage Bond	277

CHAPTER XVI

TREATMENT	278
Married Hostility particularly liable to occur, if there are Morbid Conditions or Abnormal Tendencies	278
It is necessary to call in the Physician both in these Cases and in Serious Cases of "Normal" Hostility	279
The "Marriage Doctor" and the Demands he has to Satisfy	280
Eclectic Psychotherapy	281

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Importance of the Persuasion Method	282
Self-treatment and its Basic Principles	283
Remedies and Methods	284
Self-persuasion based on Insight	286
Wordless Suggestion, Suggestion and Auto-suggestion	288
" As-if " considered as a Theory of Life	290
 FINAL SURVEY	 291
 EPILOGUE	 293
 APPENDIX	 297
<p>Forty-three Illustrations taken from Life and Works of Art to demonstrate what was said in Chapter XIII. regarding the various Physical Types with reference to Selection in Marriage and Character.</p>	

SEX HOSTILITY IN MARRIAGE

FIRST SECTION

THE ORIGIN OF HOSTILITY IN MARRIAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As long as I can remember, my friend, Henry von B., the well-known author, has spent the month of May with me.

In earlier years and during his first marriage, he came alone ; the marriage soon proved to have been a mistake, but later he married again, and always brought his second wife with him.

My wife and I were glad to see her. We liked her, not only because she had more than compensated our friend for the past unhappy years, but also because her frank and gay nature made it a real pleasure to be together with her. The happiness that radiated from her seemed to warm the atmosphere about her. And so we were really sorry that the previous year she had had to go to a health resort, and had been prevented from coming, and this year we were genuinely disappointed when Henry came alone. It appeared that his wife's visit to the health resort had to be repeated at this period.

Our disappointment was even greater as we noticed that all did not seem well with him.

He was nervous, irritable, unsettled, taciturn and reserved.

My wife had never seen him like this, and I had not for many years.

What disturbed me most was that he had nothing to read to us. It had become customary for him to bring with him all he had written. After he had read his writings to me alone, and then to my wife and myself, he finally revised them.

I never imagined that he did this because of any particular appreciation of my literary ability, but explained it by the well-known fact that many thoughts are only fully developed when they have stood the test of discussion, and have been traced to their very source.

However this may be, the custom had become familiar to us—it was a fact. If Henry had nothing to read to me he must have written nothing. I knew only too well what this meant as far as my friend's mental well-being was concerned, and for this reason I was worried. I tried to draw him out and find what was troubling him. In vain: "There is nothing wrong," he said. I did not press him further, and hoped he would voluntarily unburden his heart when he had stayed a little longer with us. We allowed him to do what he liked. He went for long walks, accompanied only by his dog, a loyal companion he invariably took with him.

Suddenly this was changed. He stayed at home, but we saw just as little of him as before. We sometimes heard him pacing up and down his room, talking at times to his dog, and we knew that his light burned far into the night. This state of affairs lasted only for a few days. One morning he came down. He looked very haggard and still spoke hardly at all, but he *stayed* and came and sat by me in my study. I felt that he had written something, but I asked no questions.

In the evening at dinner (the piano stood open for the first time since his arrival); he suddenly burst out, "I must read it to you. But I warn you it will be quite different from what you expect of me." He turned to my wife, apologizing still further, and said, "Please don't think I am mad! a writer has strange ideas sometimes. Do

not worry, after I have read it I shall destroy the manuscript."

We sat down as we used to do previously, but what we heard filled us with increasing dismay. It was a short monodrama¹ entitled "The Twilight of Love," in which a man, partly in monologue and partly talking with his dog, becomes fully aware of the waning of the love that had united him to his wife. While he is reflecting on the "charged atmosphere," the friction, slowly but surely increasing, and the absence of any trace, both in great and small things, of the erstwhile harmony, he admits to himself, "Even against our will our minds unfailingly think of those things that separate us; just as unfailingly as they formerly bathed everything in radiance and brought everything to the foreground that could bind us more closely to one another." He continues: "Is it my fault? Hers? Neither, and yet both of us are to blame."

"Quite right! We were fools—we did not wish to have children so as always to remain lovers, even in marriage."

"Illusion is short and repentance. . . . When the end of our love began to come there was nothing to replace it."

"Blame?"

"Is a flower to blame because it fades? And can men alter the fact that satiation follows the satisfaction of their desires—(in a halting, then bitter, ironical tone) and boredom? that, like every living thing love too contains in it the seeds of disease, death and decay?"

"It is simple and happens daily, the old story of growing and perishing. But to those who experience it. . . ."

In his despair at the end of this love on which both he and his wife have built their whole lives, the man in the drama decides to die together with her. He shoots her dead while she is asleep and then takes poison.

His state of mind is shown in the closing lines of the play: (his head buried in his hands, he gazes at the portrait of his wife): "Without you! and yet with you. But in this way! (he covers his eyes with his hand) oh! why are we not together . . . long ago, when all was fair. . . ."

¹ Monodrama is the Greek term for a drama acted by one person alone.

(He falls back, his hands limp, just as if going to sleep).
 "We should not outlive our happiness. . . ."

This was the end of the monodrama, and it was only by a great effort that my friend was able to read on till the end. His voice faltered and his hands trembled.

He sat there disconsolate. I was silent until he became himself once more.

My wife did not say a word. I saw by the trembling of her mouth that she fought to control herself. Then, breaking the tension, she spoke without raising her eyes: "You should *not* have written that, Henry." And as if talking to herself she quoted *Goethe's* "Blessed Longing" (*Westöstlichen Divan*. The Singer's Book) that wonderful poem culminating in the supreme stanza:

"As long as you know it not,
 The coming and the going,
 You are a melancholy guest
 In this sad world."

When she finally asked, "*How* could you write such a thing?" he seemed to awake as from a dream.

Then he only said, "I *had* to."

After a short silence for some time he added: "Cannot this dying become new life again, for me too? At least I have unburdened myself—I feel almost purified."

He sighed deeply and stretched out his hand to her:

"Don't be angry. I promised I would tear it up." And he was really about to do this.

Then I spoke: "No, Henry, don't do that. Give it to me. Let us talk. *Now* you can tell me everything."

My wife understood that I did not speak only as a friend, and she soon left us alone.

His resistance was broken and he unburdened himself completely. Naturally there were no new aspects to the case, but that was unnecessary. The cry from the depths of the artist's soul was enough. While he had been reading, Ibsen's words had occurred to me:

"Life means, to fight the spectre of the dark powers within you;
 To write; to sit in judgment on your own self!"

What the "patient" said further only confirmed that these lines were applicable both to his life and his writing (to this particular drama at any rate).

The first part of his short monodrama was a confession, while the second introduced catharsis in the form of an imagined reaction.¹

Catharsis, release and purification, both in the sense of dramatic writing and of psychotherapy (particularly psychoanalysis).

Neither he nor this marriage, therefore, had been spared the struggle between attraction and repulsion, which leads to a crisis in the lives of most married couples (usually in the second five years of marriage).

It was clear from the depression of the "patient" and from the violence of his poetic reaction, that this crisis was serious.

But the fact that, thanks to his artistic intuition, confession and catharsis had been attained, was a favourable symptom, and the numerous signs that a strong bond still existed, contributed to convince me, provided suitable measures were taken, that things would come right in the end. Naturally only if the symptoms were shown to be no more serious in his wife.

I went to her. She appeared, like so many women, wiser than her husband as far as her attitude to the marriage was concerned.

Nevertheless, she too lacked insight and training.

I had the privilege of helping them to achieve this insight and to guide their training.

Thus the crisis was passed. "And they lived happily ever afterwards."

My friend gave me permission to do what I liked with his manuscript in gratitude for my help.

¹ The idea of catharsis was first introduced by Aristotle to explain the effect of tragedy: pity and terror, aroused by the drama, exercise a purifying influence on the emotions of the onlooker and purge him and the author. The term catharsis is employed in psychology to denote the consciousness of repressed thoughts, wishes or emotions (hidden in the depths of the subconscious mind), thus making it possible to combat these thoughts, now in the conscious mind, in a rational manner by a reasonable, methodical process, far better than driving the thoughts into the unconscious which often causes morbid disturbances.

CHAPTER II

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SEXUAL AVERSION

THE clinical teacher who takes a specific illness and its treatment as the subject of his lectures, preferably cites a particular case as an introduction, in order to bring his hearers directly to the root of the matter. Such was my purpose in writing the previous chapter. Speaking in clinical language we had before us a case of "conjugal aversion," a disease which, in its acute forms, is not only far from rare, but, in its milder stages, is very frequently encountered. Indeed, symptoms of this kind are so frequent that it is questionable whether the less marked cases of this class ought to be regarded as really unhealthy, or as an almost normal condition. To determine this question, we must first make up our minds whether the partners to the marriage, or marriage itself, is to be regarded as the patient.

We shall confine ourselves, to begin with, to the husband and wife.

Of course, the catharsis of the preceding monodrama, resulting from the poetic reaction of an artist's temperament, must be left out of account, for it is patent that serious mental disturbances must have accompanied the events described above. They pass through the form of a waking dream to the final relief. The particular symptoms of the case of *von B.* himself however, disclose a nervous irritability which at times borders upon the pathological, but which, speaking generally, cannot be called really characteristic of a morbid condition. If the relationship between the husband and wife, through constant irritation and friction, caused the unfavourable environment to be unduly prolonged, the condition would become definitely morbid. And should that happen without any improvement in the marital relationship,

or without the escape of one of the partners from the injurious environment: in other words, if the husband and wife are not separated for a sufficiently long time, then functional physical disturbance is bound to follow, unless, in the meanwhile, they have become accustomed to each other, have come to some understanding, or those "points of irritability" have become neutralised. It is evident that the effects of the morbidly irritable mental condition of one or of both the persons concerned, added to the mental irritation, are particularly injurious. In this way, the vicious circle becomes complete, and incidents occur that we read of in the newspapers, or in books. It is obvious that such events take place at an earlier date if the sexual antagonism is rooted in a pathological Psyche.

In such cases, similar to those described by *Strindberg* in some of his dramas, circumstances arise which turn marriage literally into a hell.

Generally, however, it is not so much the husband and wife, as marriage itself, that shows signs of disease.

Marriage is a unit, an independent organism, which may be more forcibly compared to a firm or partnership consisting of two partners, a society composed of many members, or the State; it is just this unit (this organism of marriage) that is endangered by disease. The dangers of disease are great. If, in exceptional cases, the disease leads to a catastrophe affecting, as in the above-mentioned drama, the onlooker so profoundly, less striking cases, the consequences of which are none the less terrible, are by no means infrequent. There are many cases, the direct consequence of this disease, in which the marriage organism is destroyed by indifference or exhaustion. We are therefore dealing with a serious and dangerous malady, and, in addition, with a disease that, in its simple primary forms—which very often lead to more serious symptoms later—is so common that, as we have already asked ourselves, we have to consider if it is to be regarded as normal, as an inevitable development of the organism. We shall see—in my opinion only up to a certain point, however—that this is really the case.

As I explained in the first part of this trilogy ("Ideal Marriage"¹), marriage has evolved from the sexual impulse and is based on this impulse. According to the "Law of the Variability of Emotion," which has been demonstrated by *W. Stekel* as the "Law of Bi-Polarity" in agreement with *Bleuler's* "Ambivalence Theory," the appearance of one image immediately evolves its opposite. In his work "The Speech of Dreams," not only all impulses, but all emotional events are irrevocably co-determined by their opposite. Repulsion and Desire are two poles between which our pleasant and unpleasant emotions fluctuate.² Repulsion not only alternates with desire, but is part of it. For example, in the desire for power, which is the theme of *Alfred Adler's* theory of "Individual Psychology"—there is always present a desire to humiliate oneself. Sexual antagonism is so closely associated with sexual attraction that—again according to *Stekel*—sexual feelings do not exist where antagonism is absent. Antagonism must inevitably be present, for it forms an essential component of sexual emotion, the reversal of the impulse of attraction, and must be regarded as being inseparably bound up with the impulse of attraction. This Doctrine³ makes it evident that the symptoms of sexual hostility must be normal, since they form part of every marriage.

Every pole has its opposite pole; there is repulsion in every attraction; there is sexual antagonism in marriage contained in sexual attraction in marriage; in married love there is also married hatred. But, if we wish to conceive this theory as a *law*, we must go further than this explanation of the origin of the malady with which we have been dealing. For, in spite of the insight it gives, its fatalism

¹ "Ideal Marriage, its Physiology and Technique," by *Th. H. van de Velde*. (Wm. Heinemann (Medical Books) Ltd., London, 1928.)

² *W. Stekel*. "Nervous Conditions of Fear and Their Treatment." (Urban and Schwarzenberg, Vienna.)

³ *Bleuler* and *Stekel*, too, have had forerunners. *Nietzsche* was well aware of the fact that every human impulse works in two opposing directions, and is therefore "ambivalent"; cf. his "Genealogy of Morals," and *Morselli* shows, in the Italian *Illustrated Medical Review*, No. 7, 1925, that *Mantegazza* was familiar with this phenomenon.

Leonardo da Vinci, with his universal genius, observed this, and expressed it in his picture, "*John the Baptist*."

prevents us, at any rate to some extent, from finding ways and means of fighting this disease (for it often *is* a disease) with prospects of success. However enthralling it may be to penetrate the causes and origin of human suffering—to whatever extent it may satisfy the pure scientist—for the physician it is not enough. His task is to help to prevent if he can, or in some way to effect a cure. It is essential of course, that the methods he employs should, as far as possible, be based on *an understanding of the causes* and of the development of the disease he has to fight. We shall therefore strive, in dealing with sexual antagonism in marriage, to proceed further by means other than those indicated in the theory of the variability of emotion.

If we thoroughly examine this theory, we are met with another question which, if answered in the affirmative, presents a still further dilemma, so similar in its nature as to be confused with the problem just dealt with.

This is the matter to be determined. Does there exist in addition to hatred, as opposed to love, or to sexual repulsion as opposed to sexual attraction (or, better, to antecedents causing, as I prefer to call them, secondary repulsion) a primary, genuine sexual hostility? However much I may deplore the fatalistic inferences which, apparently, to some extent at least, must be deduced from this, I find myself compelled to answer the question in the affirmative. The matter is far from simple. If we refer to books by experts on the subject, we find a great number of analytical descriptions of individual cases, where hatred between the sexes appears to be the primary focus of the phenomenon, but we look in vain for a definite, fundamental and comprehensive attitude towards the problem.

The eminent psychiatrists with whom I have corresponded on this subject have confirmed this view.

Just as often as we encounter the "hatred between the sexes" in the works of scientists (*e.g.*, in *Hans von Hattingberg's* excellent essay, "Marriage as an Analytical Situation," and in *Keyserling's* "Book of Marriage") or in literature, so it is seldom that the authors give us an analysis of that

word, or a synthesis of the concept. I have also approached ethnologists to discover if the existence of a primary sexual antagonism among primitive peoples might be presumed, but again without success. Zoologists have just as little to say regarding the existence or absence of sexual antagonism. Nevertheless, the observation of creatures whose mental life is simpler (more primitive) than our own, would be of great assistance in the solution of this question.

It is therefore of importance that in *Friedrich Alverdes'* book, "Animal Sociology," numerous facts are given, which, although they are not treated in connection with our problem, give us some help.

Our task is to observe the behaviour of male and female animals towards each other, and to their opposite sexes, outside the mating season. For during this mating period the sexual feelings predominate over all others. Then attraction between male and female predominates, and antagonism between animals of the same sex, for at this time they regard each other only as rivals for the favour of the opposite sex.

It follows from the manner in which Nature has distributed the rôles in sexual intercourse, that this mutual antagonism between those of the same sex becomes particularly acute in the male, often developing into a life and death struggle. But what is the attitude of animals when the attraction of sex is not predominant? In this period, too, we find enmity between the males among species of animals living in relatively small herds or groups, but for an entirely different reason. It is the "will to power"—an instinct which is highly developed in all living things—that strives with all its strength to eliminate rivals from the leadership, in order to rule unrestricted over the other members of the species. Certain of the weaker, usually the younger males, come under this rule, but, generally, it is naturally the female. As opposed to this, hostility between the females is negligible, and it is clear that the principal reason they live with the males is that they wish to be protected and led by the stronger, while, in addition, a certain desire to subjugate themselves (the reversal of the "will to power") may be present.

Again, it is for precisely the same reason that, as is the case among many other species of animals, a number of females put themselves under the leadership of an older female, or a group of males submit to the rule of the strongest or most experienced of their number.

These conditions are of importance for us, because the analogy as regards man is obvious. A fact, however, that is of far greater importance to us for the solution of our problem is that, in numerous species of animals, males and females live, outside the mating season, in particular separate herds, or divide into groups within the herd itself. This is often the case outside the pairing season among mammals living in herds.

C. H. Schillings gives interesting data with regard to this in his books "With Flashlight and Rifle" and "The Magic of the Elelescho." Such a manner of life is particularly common among ungulates. African and Indian elephants, however, are the most striking examples; both the African and the Indian males and females gather into particular herds, the female herd is led by a female and the young also follow this herd: if, in exceptional cases, such a herd joins with the males, the separation is maintained, especially during halts for rest on the trek. This procedure only changes during the rutting season; then a male takes a group of females from time to time into what we may call his harem.

Somewhat similar relationships are found among entirely different species of animals, such as walrus, seals, bats, wild turkeys and pheasants, and, of the fishes, roaches (*Leuciscus rutilus*).

Animals that live monogamously during propagation period, but afterwards separate and spend the rest of the year in groups of the same sex, afford a still better insight into these relationships.

The male and female meet again in the next mating season either in the same "marriage" as in the previous year, or they form fresh relationships from year to year. The most extreme attitude is found among those species (to which, for example, the hamster belongs) where the sexual hostility is so strong, that a male encountering a

female outside the rutting season, bites her to death and leaves her lying without bothering about the body.

If we consider these facts in correlation with various customs and habits known to us regarding primitive peoples ; if, further, we have penetrated into the intimate lives of a sufficiently large number of people whose emotions are simple ; and if, finally, we are able to distinguish, in the educated classes, the primitive feelings—then, if all this has been weighed and considered, we must, in my opinion, come to the conclusion that a primary sexual antagonism does indeed exist.

We can deduce from the facts cited above that individuals of the same sex are led by sexual antagonism to associate together.

Such is nearly always the case with females, and is also common among males. It is, however, by no means rare for the male to lead a solitary life outside the mating season, and, indeed, it is the rule with certain species of animals, especially among the older males.¹

In regard to human beings, both primitive and civilised, the older men show more inclination to live apart from their kind than women. Such males are, however, for the most part, those who have left the sexual period of their lives behind them, while, among the species of animals referred to above, males who are in full possession of their sexual powers lead a solitary existence from time to time. The association of individuals of the same sex has nothing to do with (homo-) sexual motives. It is the result of the gregarious instinct, of the communal impulse, which, generally speaking, are innate characteristics. The urge to form a community and the impulse of sexual attraction are united in love-making, and these factors are most closely associated with each other in marriage.

The desire to form a community is, in itself, asexual,

¹ See *Brehm's "Animal Life,"* complete edition (Bibliographical Institute, Leipzig).

as is also the association of those of the same sex—with the proviso that this impulse, in the negative sense (so far as the exclusion of individuals of the opposite sex is concerned) is *not* asexual.

Secondary sexual antagonism must now be regarded more closely. One of the most characteristic examples of this antipathy—although it may appear to the superficial observer as if there had never been any question of attraction—is the typical hatred of men shown by quite a large proportion of “old maids,” and the curious, almost nervous antagonism shown by certain men towards women. It is quite certain that these phenomena have their bases in a reversal of the impulse of sexual attraction. They are the result of repression of the sexual impulse, of the banishment of sexual feelings from the sphere of the conscious mind, a banishment that occurs partly owing to the unconscious mental processes, but which, in the majority of cases, is conscious and requires all the will-power and other mental faculties for its achievement. The effort required to repress sexual impulses, where impulse is strong—and it is known to be strong in such cases—is a metabolism of energy.

The necessary exertion is, indeed, very often so great that the power of resistance, the will power at any rate, is inadequate and breaks down, and the person, in spite of himself, succumbs to his impulse in one way or another. Remorse, self-reproach, worry and shame result ; for we are speaking here of people who have, or believe they have, reasons energetically to fight, and wish to fight their sexual impulses.

Shame and worry and the struggle begins again. Is it any wonder that the man begins to hate the impulse which has been the cause of so much trouble and hardship, of so many emotional storms ? Need we be astonished that the hatred is centred upon the opposite sex, that nevertheless attracts the man, but which he wishes to avoid ? Hence springs the basis of his antipathy to members of the opposite sex, and of his complaint of the suffering he imagines they have caused him ; hence also his desire to be guaranteed against further disturbance of his mental equilibrium.

It comes to this, therefore, that in such a case, sexual antagonism is nothing less than a fear of attraction (though being part of the attraction itself), and this argument should be clear even to those to whom psychoanalysis is only a name, and who have no understanding of the law of the ambivalence of emotion, which is the mainspring of this theory.

Similarly, sex antagonism, apparent in young men and girls, is partially attributable to unconscious self-defence. They feel instinctively the power that the sexual impulse will have over them ; involuntarily they resist and avoid the opposite sex in the subconscious desire that their equilibrium shall not be disturbed.

This again is a reversal of the sexual impulse ; a secondary erotic antagonism, taking the form of a kind of prudery, in which a certain amount of hypocrisy is not wholly absent.

We call this antagonism secondary, as it arises from the original, primary, sexual impulse, particularly from the impulse of attraction.

The impulse of attraction results from internal secretion of the sex glands, a secretion which, when it first begins to take effect in young people, makes a profound impression on the mental processes. I cannot continue to repeat indefinitely what I have already stated in my book "Ideal Marriage," and I shall assume that those who read this book have also read the first volume. Those who do not remember what was said there regarding certain matters that are being dealt with here, should read again Chapter II., particularly pages 12—14, of "Ideal Marriage."

A shy reserve such as this is often encountered in somewhat older people in the first stages of love. "The one avoids the other or even behaves in a hostile manner, but in such a way that an onlooker cannot fail to recognise an unconscious interest—an admixture of attraction and antagonism, which

has a deep teleological meaning, and is favourable to the strengthening and ripening of love.”¹

I cite this example of the undoubted ambivalence of the erotic feelings to show that they may also have a favourable effect on the individual, and not to demonstrate another form of genuine sexual hostility. There is obviously no question of it in this case.

Again, all the more strongly marked is the antagonism found in a certain group of cases, based also on a reversal, indeed, on a distortion, of particular feelings, but which is quite different in its nature from the aversion with which I have dealt up to the present. By this, I mean the singular feelings of hatred mingled with a certain contempt displayed by some women, unsatisfied in marriage, towards their husbands or towards men in general. Such a woman feels instinctively—sometimes she *knows* it from her theoretical knowledge of sexual physiology—that satisfaction is denied to her owing either to her husband’s selfishness or his ignorance. If she consoles herself with some other person who is able to satisfy her impulses, she will begin to hate her husband, for she has now proved that, given the right man, she too can know complete happiness in love. Though the inadequacy of her husband is now proved, she will hate him for other reasons besides : he still makes sexual demands upon her ; and he can only be regarded as the cause of the failure of their married life. None but a frivolous woman can be indifferent to such a reproach, let the world be ignorant of her failure or not. Nor, if she is capable of deeper emotions, does she “ care to live between two men.” Moreover, if the man from whom she seeks consolation, is unable to bestow the requisite happiness, then—especially if the woman is a pathological subject—the apparently frivolous but, in reality, tragic hunt for love begins, bringing always greater disappointment, with ever increasing (the greater the disappointment proportionately the increase) reversal of feelings, accompanied by hatred against the whole male

¹ *Alfred Vierhandt in Max Marcuse's "Handbook of Sexual Science," 2nd edition. (Marcus and Weber, Bonn.)*

sex. These feelings are often expressed in outbursts of hatred against those who have not been able to give the desired satisfaction. Or, and this is much more common, the woman who has not found happiness, either with her lover or in a second marriage, represses her sexual feelings, which may, if she cannot sublimate them, cause a reversal of the attraction impulse and lead to the appearance of neurotic symptoms.

The expression "to sublimate" requires some explanation. The word was first used only in chemical experiments, in which a solid but soluble body could be separated by heat from other insoluble substances—the first body then being deposited in solid form in a cool place. Thus solution, evaporation and sedimentation occur and further, owing to purification during the process, the substance increases in value.

Freud introduced the idea of "sublimation" in psychology in order to show that in the same way, the object and aim of the sexual impulse could be changed into certain equivalents which, though no longer sexual, were of greater value to humanity, and also, in a certain sense and in particular circumstances, to the individual. Here, too, solution and sedimentation take place—compare also the meaning of the word sublime.

Creative mental activity is similar, in that it is sublimated in Poetry, Art and Religion. In short, where the natural expression of sex is prevented from being demonstrative, the whole of human imaginative life, in the widest sense, may produce like equivalents (*Bloch*). But it must not be forgotten that brutality, anger and hatred may accompany repression.

The mental processes referred to, sublimation, reversal and repression, often appear simultaneously, resulting in the familiar type of "man hater," which needs no further description. The contempt with which such women regard men is a reversal of the respect they would have been ready to have paid him; and also of the desire to be subjected,

which is frequently encountered, and is a characteristic quality of the feminine mind.

The whole process is, therefore, a particularly important example of the ambivalence of human emotion. One can go further and adduce an example, amusing to some extent to the onlooker, of the woman, dissatisfied with men and hating and despising them, yet trying at the same time to adopt as many masculine traits as possible. It would, however, be singularly erroneous to suppose that attempts to find sexual satisfaction which the husband cannot give, are important links in the causation of the chain of events leading to reversal. On the contrary, it is often without effect. Even when the husband has made no attempt further to form his wife's half-developed sexual feelings, there is no question of any other man for the wife, since she regards the marriage oath of fidelity as a dogma. Such a woman, unconsciously and directly (without taking advice), seeks her salvation in the reversal of her sexual feelings, simply in order to escape the dangers of repression. But the result is again antipathetic.

It is best, for the comparative success of the marriage, that the sexually unsatisfied woman should have children, and succeed in converting her sexual feelings into a stronger mother love (hence to sublimate them). Happily this often occurs.

The danger of a man thus turning against the whole female sex because of this is relatively slight. There are two reasons for this: first (unless physical factors, making coitus impossible, are present) the man can only remain sexually unsatisfied in marriage up to a certain point. Even if his wife does not give him that happiness in love he had hoped for, yet he succeeds in reaching orgasm, in ejaculation; this is a result of his natural physiological reflexes. In any case, he achieves physical satisfaction and the tension is relaxed. The mental tension, which existed before coitus, will also be removed to some degree.

The feeling of mental dissatisfaction, however, may, at this time be very strong and be accompanied by disappoint-

ment and antipathy and even, indeed, by disgust ; it may lead to a genuine momentary hatred against his wife, who has, if only temporarily, shattered his dream. If these feelings are revived every time, they become chronic, although possibly weaker.

We have here a particularly good example of the sudden appearance of feelings of hatred, as the reverse of sexual attraction, and, at the same time, of the less tempestuous, but also very important, continuous sexual antipathy, as the negative corollary of Love. The fact that it is chiefly the husband's fault if his wife disappoints him, because, for some reason or other, he has failed to instruct her in necessary elements of sexual love, cannot alter this antagonism—owing to the fact that usually he does not know that he is to blame, or refuses to admit it.

The secondary sexual antagonism here dealt with is directed against one woman alone, not against women as a whole. We have just considered the first factor : the second is that, in many cases, the husband has reasonable expectations of finding satisfaction elsewhere, without difficulty. In general, he has fewer qualms of conscience about this, and more opportunity of finding a suitable person to fall in with his desires. The more, however, he tries to achieve perfect harmony in this respect, the less likely is he to attain his end. This is the reason for the easily understandable phenomenon that the great idealist in love, if he tries to find happiness in *taking* and not in *giving*, is in the greatest danger of becoming, and remaining, a pessimist in his attitude towards women, and of his sexual antagonism towards one or a number of women developing into an aversion against the whole feminine sex.

A sudden antagonism, based on a reversal of the love emotion and resulting in a mental trauma (injury) occurs in a woman whose husband has acted tactlessly or roughly at the time of defloration, or, more often, whose defloration attempts have not been successful.

This mental antagonism may lead to a conscious, or semi-conscious physical resistance, sometimes accompanied

by extreme sensitiveness of the vulva, spasms of the pelvic floor, and hyperesthesia (vaginismus) of the sexual parts.

It must, however, be noted that vaginismus only occurs in women who both locally, in general and also mentally, have certain infantile characteristics, or who, for other reasons, cannot be considered as of normal mind. In certain exceptional cases vaginismus may occur in such women, even if the man has behaved cautiously and considerately in his attempts at defloration, but has neglected, after repeated failures, to call in an experienced physician in time. Furthermore, even if a woman, mentally and physically normal, offers resistance to a brutal and insatiable husband in the first days of marriage, she will not contract vaginismus although she may be antagonistic to him from time to time, or permanently.

It must also be mentioned that the result of satiety, if the sexual desires are allowed unbridled licence, is a reversal of the impulse of attraction. Fortunately, we may add that, in acute cases which do not recur too frequently, this antagonism is only a passing phase, as it leads, in itself, to the necessary restraint which, later, gives place to renewed desire.

In its milder forms, this fluctuation of the sexual emotions between desire and satiety is a typical instance of normal variation (variability).

“ Kisses are sweet,
Even too much of kissing there may be,
Stay for a while.”

Folk songs and popular rhymes often contain important psychological truths.

In concluding my examination of the various forms in which the reversal of sexual attraction occurs, I recall to mind the well-known old Dutch proverb :

“ When Love turns to Hate, it knows no bounds.”

In fact, this is by no means rare, and such hatred may be very strong. It usually arises from unrequited or, at first, requited and then rejected love. In this case it is generally

found in only one of the partners (the other is merely indifferent or is slightly hostile sexually) and is more or less acute. It may appear in chronic form in both the man and woman, if they have lived together for some time, and have become estranged from each other later both erotically and otherwise. Here again such hatred may be the cause of terrible suffering. It is, however, no longer a purely sexual, but a conjugal hatred, which is far more complex, and just because of this, owing to the unlimited opportunities it has for showing itself, it leads to some of the saddest occurrences in human life.

We have now concluded the examination of secondary antagonism arising from the reversal of attraction, and will proceed to the investigation of primary, genuine, sexual antagonism.

We observe that the weaker the effect of erotic attraction, the more apparent it is. As far as animal life is concerned, we have already discussed such phenomena in detail. Similar phenomena may be observed among primitive peoples, whose sexual impulses in their nature and strength closely resemble the animals, inasmuch as short periods in which the impulse is very strong alternate with longer lapses of time during which the impulse is very weak or altogether dormant. The weaker the sexual impulse, the stronger the undeniably antagonistic effect of the opposite sex, which takes the form of a natural repugnance towards those parts of the body in which the sex is most clearly apparent, that is to say the external sexual organs.

This repugnance extends to all the organs of sense that come into consideration here, feeling, sight and smell, and is manifested in aversion to touching the sexual parts and in disgust at the sight of them, and at the odour they give forth.

It is understandable, but no less interesting on that account, that similar phenomena may be observed in individuals whose sexual life is, in some respects, primitive, even though they belong to the civilized part of humanity. I

refer to children, some considerable period before they have reached sexual maturity, when *Libido sexualis* (sexual desire) is present and, indeed, in many respects, is very marked, but for whom the sexual parts have no attraction whatever, and who have no knowledge of these organs in the sexual sense. Frequently boys, between the ages of six and ten, and men who can and *wish* to recall the sexual experiences of their childhood, state that the sight of the female sexual parts, even in a state of sexual excitement, produced a feeling of disgust and consequent disappearance of the excitement.

The story of the boy who reaches a state of erection after the manipulation of his genitals by a sexually mature woman, very often a nurse, and is induced to touch her vulva, an action that causes such disgust that he takes to flight at once, is not at all uncommon and is very typical.

It is not of great importance which of the above mentioned organs of sense produced the effect of repulsion. In spite of this, it is noteworthy that while in one case the touch and in another the sight is mentioned, the emphasis laid on the strong impression made by odour in such an incident is always present.

It is also probable that uncleanness has often a great deal to do with it, but there is no doubt that an essential psychological factor is also involved. (To those who care to study the problem in greater detail, I recommend *Hans Henning's* book, "Smell," a handbook dealing with Psychology, Physiology, Botany, Chemistry, etc., 2nd edition, Joh. Ambr. Barth, Leipzig, 1924).¹

It is more important for us to observe the attitude to such memories, because it clears up, to a large extent, the problem with which we are dealing here.

It usually takes the following form: during the next few years until puberty is reached, the remembrance remains as repellent as the incident itself. But with the coming of sexual maturity, the character of the mind picture

¹ Also *Dan McKenzie*: "Aromatics and the Soul." A Study of Smells. (William Heinemann (Medical Books), Ltd., London, 1923.)

gradually changes. The unpleasant side recedes into the background, and feelings of desire become more and more prominent until, finally, the remembrance of the feminine sexual parts, once so repellent, becomes sexually stimulating.

This course of events is truly typical, and shows clearly how the original antagonism to the opposite sex recedes and becomes veiled over as soon as the sexual impulse is powerful enough. It depends, therefore, only on the temporary mood of the individual whether the same impression induces antagonism or attraction; to put it more concisely, whether the primary antagonism, for it is a case of primary antagonism here and not of secondary, arising from reversal of the essential feelings, or the primary attraction, will determine the reaction to this impression. In the case in point, the mood is entirely directed by the influence of the sex glands. As long as they function to a negligible extent, or not at all, the instinctive sexual antagonism predominates, but, if their effect has become strong enough, then sexual attraction is predominant, to such a degree, indeed, that the previous all-powerful feelings of antagonism recede and seem to disappear entirely from the scene.

We shall return later to this individual disposition, which is generally influenced by a series of other factors, but first we shall consider more closely what follows when the experience in childhood is not worked out in the healthy manner described above, or—and this occurs very rarely—is entirely forgotten, but is driven forcibly into the sphere of the unconscious mind by fear of the “forbidden.” This may cause symptoms of repression that appear as disturbances of the mental life (neurotic symptoms). It may also have the result that the sexual impulse—whether it follows directly on the experience or occurs later—succumbs to the primary antagonism, which, being a stifled emotion, has an exceptionally strong effect on the subconscious mind. Such a condition may result in an opposition to marriage which it is difficult to overcome. It can also (if the opposition is overcome, but if the mental inhibition has not been removed)

bring about a sexual antagonism in marriage, which may soon develop into a general hostility.

This general hostility is usually wrongly regarded as secondary, arising from a reversal of love. It should, however, be clear, after what has been said here, that it is primary and genuine. In every single case of this nature, psycho-analysis will enable the physician to discover the cause of the symptoms, to remove the inhibition, and thus bring about the disappearance of the antagonistic state. This shows that, in many cases of antagonism in marriage, the help of the physician will not be called in in vain.

If here the continuous predominance of primary sexual antagonism has a pathological basis in the repression and inhibition of an emotion, there are other cases where this antagonism makes its influence felt, although to a much lesser degree, in normal sexually mature people. Such a condition of things arises if a somewhat primitive inner life is found in combination with sexual desires. Among persons of this type, primary sexual antagonism is demonstrated in a genuine aversion to the sight and even more to the odour of the sexual parts of the opposite sex. Sexual attraction relatively seldom predominates among such people, and then only for a short period, and the antagonism is never wholly concealed. Statements made by these people are to be found in scientific works and do not admit of the slightest doubt in regard to the strength of such antagonism; and I, myself, have met various people, of both sexes, belonging to this type, who expressed themselves quite unequivocally. For people of this kind, the only importance of sexual relations is the satisfaction of the purely physical impulse. If the impulse is aroused in them, they follow it without any thought of erotic love or any sort of preparation beforehand, while, immediately afterwards, the previous antagonism again predominates.

Even during the short time—usually only a few minutes—in which the sexual impulse predominates, such people cannot be induced to look at or to touch the sexual parts of the person with whom they are having intercourse—so great

is the aversion. And a case communicated to me is by no means unique, where such a man, about to have coitus, as soon as he smelt the odour of the feminine sexual organs, immediately ceased to have an erection and had to leave the room, so great was his disgust.

Such symptoms are undoubtedly to be found among people with a radically differentiated emotional life, and particularly sensitive sexual feelings. Indeed, I am convinced that most, if not all, men of this type could discover such tendencies in themselves if they practised observation for a little time and examined their emotional symptoms. I, in any case, know of a small number of such men who have a strong libido and actively desire connection, for whom the sensual feelings connected with the feminine sexual parts are generally pleasurable and welcome, but who, during periods (or days) when the sexual impulse is weaker, have to overcome a definite *horror feminæ* occasioned not only by the sight and odour of the sexual parts, but also by the touch, if circumstances (the obvious desire of the woman) make it necessary for them to have sexual connection.

The aversion naturally felt by a woman in this regard, when she is not sexually excited, must be apparent to everyone who claims to have a knowledge of mankind and has the opportunity of making observations. Even if it be admitted that feelings of sexual modesty are partly responsible for the fact that a woman (that is to say a woman with an equally strongly differentiated emotional inner life) tries to avoid looking at the sexual parts of a man, even those of the man she loves, it does not necessarily follow that primary and primitive sexual antagonism are of predominant importance. Indeed, the question arises whether *this* kind of modesty should not be considered simply as a part of the antagonism we have discussed.

Finally, we must refer to the antipathy that a man or woman, who is very greatly attracted sexually to a certain person of the opposite sex—in any case, if their sexual

feelings are fully satisfied by that person—feels, in regard to the sexual parts of other people of the opposite sex. Just as previously, the enormous importance of the disposition of the person, who experiences the impression, is clear.

The same impression affects people in different ways, and the same stimulus leads in the same individual, at a given moment, to quite a different reaction from that occurring on another occasion. This is a well-known law of nature that holds good for all human beings, and we must never leave it out of account in considering the problems with which we are dealing.

For the general as well as the temporary disposition is extremely important as regards the way in which a person will react to stimulation of his sexual emotions. Whether, for example—to return to the field of our observations—primary sexual antagonism or, as is far more often the case, the sexual impulse will show itself to be stronger at a definite moment in a certain individual, depends wholly on the physical and mental factors that together form the disposition.

These factors are as varied as they are numerous, and it would lead us too far if we examined them as their importance deserves. Inherited tendencies, general and sexual constitution, state of health, the influence of environment, these are more or less fluctuating, but, nevertheless, exceedingly important matters, that would have to be investigated in detail. But, even apart from this, it is clear that each of these factors is of great importance for the constitution of the sexual disposition. How great is the influence of that emotional complex we call being “head over heels in love” is well known. No less well known is the opposite, that is to say, the effect of a mental antagonism against a certain person of the opposite sex, on the sexual disposition of an individual—at all events as far as the person in question is concerned.

We may be satisfied with proceeding as far as this point, for we shall not attempt to *investigate* the extremely complex problem of the origin of the sexual disposition; it is not necessary to our purpose. If, however, we desire to

have some insight into these matters—and this is really necessary, because we would, otherwise, fail to understand a number of phenomena—we must always bear in mind one factor (more accurately, a complex of factors) which we know of from physiology. This is the function of the genital glands which, with their inner secretion (in close reciprocal effect with that of other glands), greatly influence the nature and strength of sexuality, and through their external secretions, particularly as a result of the local tension thus aroused, are a principal factor in the temporary impulse to sexual connection, thus causing the predominance of the sexual impulse over the primary sexual antagonism.

The question now arises whether in our last-mentioned examples the sexual antagonism is really primary and genuine, or has arisen from a reversal of the sexual impulse, and must thus be regarded as a secondary manifestation. In my opinion, the first hypothesis is correct, particularly owing to the fact that the aversion is mainly and almost wholly directed against the sexual parts of the opposite sex.

But I can quite well understand that the distinction between primary and secondary phenomena is the more difficult, the more complex and refined the emotional life.

I can also understand that those psychologists who consider the *Bleuler-Stekel* theory to be irrefutable and invariably true, will ask: "What are the manifestations of the ambivalence of this primary sexual antagonism, the existence of which you maintain?"

Now, the opposite of antagonism is attraction and, therefore, the attraction evoked by the sexual parts of the opposite sex may be regarded as the opposite of my theory.

If one explained all manifestations from this point of view, it might also undoubtedly be assumed that both what I call primary genuine sexual antagonism and the sexual impulse together with the sexual antagonism arising from it owing to reversal, are no more than the expression of a pendulum movement of one and the same varying sexual potency. I could agree with this, granted that the impulse that brings the sexes together, the positive factor, was not the most

important, but that the negative force, antagonism, must be regarded as the original, that is to say, the dominant impulse. Such an attitude to the problem appears to me to be too artificial in its very simplicity.

I am thus more inclined to take the following point of view which is also based on reversal : the sexual impulse is based on the desire for satisfaction (in this case identical with the desire of evacuation), and the impulse of connection. (See "Ideal Marriage," pp. 12 and 13.)

The first component part is much more primitive in its nature than the second, and is directed particularly towards the sexual parts. It may be regarded as the reversal of primary genuine sexual antagonism. The reversal of the second component part, the desire for connection, would then be antipathy, that, from the foregoing, we have learned to recognise as a secondary more general sexual antagonism.

But it is not the theory that interests us most. We are attempting to understand this problem, of such importance in sexual relationships, in order to gain thereby useful practical experience. I think, therefore, it is best, from this point of view, to summarise what has been said, in a certain respect, more precisely, clearly and comprehensively, but, at the same time, more simply and shortly, as follows :

The following sexual impulses must be considered with regard to practical life :

PRIMARY SEXUAL ANTAGONISM : A genuine basic feeling, which may also be termed *genital antagonism*. In general, impersonal, with reference to a definite individual of the opposite sex, but, occasionally, definitely personal. It usually disappears altogether owing to the sexual impulse in sexually mature individuals, but appears again in the foreground, more resistant than the sexual impulse and unimpaired, immediately this is no longer powerful enough.

THE SEXUAL IMPULSE : Composed of the impulse of approach and the desire for satisfaction (dealt with in detail in "Ideal Marriage," Chapter VIII). Dominant during a long period of life, at first impersonal, and later, strongly personal.

SECONDARY SEXUAL ANTAGONISM: Arising from a reversal of the sexual impulse, particularly from those component parts designated as the desire for connection. Also to be termed erotic antagonism. Usually strongly personal, but often, sooner or later, impersonal.

CHAPTER III

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MASCULINE AND FEMININE

FIRST PART

Typical Differences—Masculine Characteristics

“EAST is East and West is West,
And never the twain shall meet.”

Rudyard Kipling intended, in these verses, to show in a striking phrase the great contrast between East and West, not so much in its geographical, but in its psychological sense. If we alter *Kipling's* lines a little and say :

“Man is Man and Woman is Woman,
And never shall they be one,”

we have a striking definition of the difference between the sexes, not only physically but, above all, psychologically.

But, like so many other truths, the truth of this contention is merely relative.

If I turn my face to the South, do not East and West converge? Do not those who have studied the question, especially students of mystic philosophy, believe it is untrue that there is a great gulf fixed between the minds of the East and the West?

Are not Man and Woman so entirely “one” in sexual union, even if only temporarily, that I am justified in using the word “fusion”?

To keep to mankind, does not investigation of the human embryo show a bisexual predisposition which is clearly to be observed even in adults?

And, finally, do we not encounter again and again, mental

characteristics betraying bisexual and, indeed, hermaphroditic qualities ?

Nevertheless, the phrase " Man remains Man and Woman remains Woman " contains a significant truth. Many attempts have been made in recent years to prove that, psychologically, Man remains a man only in a society ruled over by men and that only in such a society does woman show those " feminine " characteristics that we consider typical of her sex. After all is said and done, the biological difference between masculine and feminine cannot be explained away ; neither can the physical and mental contrasts between man and woman proceeding from this.

This is demonstrated at the outset by the typical difference between the spermatozoon (seminal cell) and the ovum, a contrast which is again found in the fully developed man and woman. In like manner, the relationship between the sexes shows the same peculiarities as the spermatozoon and the ovum in their reciprocal connections.

" The spermatozoon, just as mobile as a uni-cellular flagellate, has attracted the attention of scientists throughout the ages ; it has long been known that the adduction of the spermatozoon by the ovum is produced by chemotaxis.

" Recent discovery has shown that the ovum does not only attract the spermatozoon ' platonically ' but actually rushes forward to meet the oncoming spermatozoon. Thus, the ovum is not a passive organ, but actively takes part in the process of impregnation. It is an organism alive with impulses, needs and passions. When impregnation takes place, it vibrates in tonic waves of contraction, and the protoplasm, crammed with yolk granules, which appeared so inactive before, is violently agitated. The advancing sperm cells and, later, the pronucleus created by the union of the two marriage nuclei, are surrounded by an aureole of light, until, finally, the whole protoplasm becomes one great radiation."

I am greatly tempted to take the last sentence of this quotation as the starting point of an examination, proceeding

from the derivation of the term "gamete" (Greek "to marry"), in order to compare the union of man and woman, in that higher unity created by true marriage, with the primitive union between masculine and feminine, as here described by *Heringa* and *Lohr*, in a strictly scientific way, but with an equally delicate feeling for the poetry of the processes of nature.

But this would be out of place here. We shall, therefore, proceed to deal with those functional characteristics that form the main points of the description quoted above, in order to discover how far and in what way they appear in the fully developed individual of both sexes.

Before we do this, however, one thing must be made plain : in recognising that there are, in several respects, essential differences between masculine and feminine, between man and woman, we must emphasise the fact that, in observing these differences, there is no intention of making any comparison in regard to their respective value.

Man and woman are different. One part is different from the other, but one part is neither better nor more useful to mankind than the other. The complete man and the complete woman are of equal worth in that they both have the same great importance for humanity, although their respective value is of a different kind.

I have written these lines (which might be called, rather consequentially, a fundamental statement) before proceeding further, in order to avoid, as far as possible, any misunderstanding, either unconscious, or as a result of a particular attitude of mind, in regard to the views I wish to express here.

Further, it is not my purpose to explain the value of masculinity and femininity for humanity, but exclusively to demonstrate the differences between man and woman as far as their mutual sex relationships are concerned.

The biological contrast between the masculine and feminine elements, observed at the outset, is that, while the spermatozöon moves freely, the ovum is immobile.

It would be natural, perhaps to deduce from this the activity of the masculine and the passivity of the feminine. It was believed that nature had distributed the parts to be played by man and woman in later life, on the one hand, owing to the "passivity," alleged to be the characteristic of the normal "woman" in the sexual act—morally speaking, this was more or less her ordained destiny—and also, because of the "passive" nature of the duties, conventionally ascribed to her by society, as opposed to the all-embracing activity demanded by life of the man.

Even if this is no longer the point of view of cultured people, such ideas are, nevertheless, still very widespread. The great masses of society believe to this day that it is the will of nature, or of God, to whom nature is subject, that in life women must remain static, while men go forth to conquer. The fact that man is active need not again be investigated. The spermatozoa have still the same mobile force and man's activity is as great as ever it was. But, with the progress of science, our opinion regarding the ovum has changed. We know that it is, by no means, passive—the above description shows that clearly enough, even if it cannot move of itself. Physiology has taught us that woman's natural part in the sexual act is far from being passive. She must herself be no less active, although her part has not the dynamic strength of the masculine. Finally, it is now sufficiently apparent that the duty assigned by nature to the woman—to live wholly for the preservation of the species—requires no less activity than is demanded of the man for the fulfilment of his allotted tasks.

If we wish to have a clear grasp of the problem, we must not forget that the ovum only loses its passive nature at the approach of the masculine element: that, generally speaking, the woman must be aroused from her passive attitude to active participation in the sexual act (apparent frigidity) by the man's skilful wooing; and that her age-old purpose in life (motherhood) cannot be achieved without the man.

It is, therefore, definitely wrong to contrast the more or less entirely passive character of the feminine with the active nature of the masculine, just as it would be incorrect not to

admit the existence of the specific difference between the masculine and feminine elements.

This difference may be best expressed, in my opinion, if we employ the terms potential and kinetic energy, used in physics.

If we consider *masculine activity* as *kinetic energy*—the *moving force*—*feminine* as *potential energy*—*elasticity, forming power, internal activity*, have we not correctly defined the basic characteristics of masculine and feminine ?

The spermatozoa, representative of the masculine element, rush, as if in rivalry, towards the feminine element, the ovum. The fittest and strongest have the greatest chance of reaching their goal.

Of itself, the ovum approaches the on-coming spermatozoa. It is the *ovum* that makes the choice. It approaches the spermatozoon, in the manner described above, and union takes place. The masculine element penetrates the whole ovum, which, simultaneously, becomes irrevocably closed to the other spermatozoa. Only one is permitted to achieve reproduction.

This analogy shows us, to its smallest detail, the mutual relationship between man and woman. I believe it to be superfluous to carry it through to its logical conclusion, and those who wish to think over the subject can do so for themselves.

The rivalry among males for the favour of the female, often a real fight, is seen everywhere in the animal world, from the lowest species to the most highly cultivated races and classes of humanity.

It is self-evident that this is combined with a natural aggressiveness. It is one of the most typical male characteristics. The preparations for this contest require continuous progress in the development of those qualities which are most likely to achieve success. Such success can be attained in two ways : either in direct victory over the rivals, or by inducing the female to make the desired choice. This struggle among the males for the female, this attraction

of the female for the male, the masculine impulse to impregnate the feminine element—if it is manifested either in the apparently and relatively simple form of the affinity of two spermatoblasts, or in the all-embracing sublimation of the eternal feminine, as expressed in the final verses of "Faust"—has contributed enormously to ever-increasing perfection of the qualities that are advantageous for the individual, for posterity and for the species.

Of no less importance than these sexual motives are those that arise from the "will to power," from the desire for perfection, which, within certain limits, are by no means to be condemned. There may be differences of opinion as to which of these impulses is the stronger. These differences do indeed exist, and *Alfred Adler*, the psychologist, and his adherents maintain the theory that those phenomena, generally considered to be expressions of the sexual impulse, must be regarded, in the main, as having their origin in the struggle for power—a struggle which is shown on the one hand, in the desire for (sexual) victory and (sexual) conquest and, on the other hand, in the tendency to self-humiliation. I take no sides in this matter, as I am convinced that both motives must be regarded as being of great importance, and that it depends first and foremost upon the physical and mental constitution and disposition of the individual whether the sexual or non-sexual side of his nature in his struggle to attain good qualities is stronger, that is to say, qualities which are of value for the individual and the species. Further, it must always be remembered that the instinct to dominate over persons of his own sex, for other reasons than of sexual rivalry, is of importance.

It is, therefore, of little significance, so far as we are concerned, whether the motives which result in the exertion of all the powers, have their origin in the sexual impulse or in the will to power. So much is certain: they are to be observed mainly in the male and in man, and thus man must, and in fact does, strive in this way to perfect the capabilities he possesses, and to achieve new qualities which will be of advantage to him.

Moreover, the male is driven still further in this direction,

owing to the struggle for existence. This is of greater importance among many species of animals, owing to the fact that nature has imposed upon the male the task of caring for and protecting his progeny as well as the female. The struggle that the man has had to wage for his own existence, for thousands of years throughout the inhabited portions of the earth, was made appreciably more difficult owing to the anxiety of looking after his family. And even now, generally speaking, this is true of our society, even if in consequence of the greater and more rapid changes in the conditions of life, the number of exceptions increases.

If all this is considered, we are forced to the conclusion that, *not only for individual reasons but also of natural necessity, man must spend the greater part of his life in trying to perfect his masculine qualities.*

In more or less primitive conditions, the physical qualities must undergo constant development, while the mental qualities are only really taken into account in so far as they are of use to the former. The greater, however, the influence of civilization on the individual and his environment, the more apparently this condition of things is reversed. For hundreds of years humanity has striven almost wholly towards perfection in the realms of the mind. Among cultured people, the contest for the woman's favour has long been decided principally by the mental qualities. The struggle for existence is chiefly and indeed almost wholly waged with the weapons of the mind, and to attain real power and to hold it, is possible by thought and reason alone.

We see proofs of this everywhere, more marked and more apparent every day, even in sport !

The necessity for man to perfect his qualities, forces him to exert all his mental powers and to concentrate his thoughts on his chosen task. *Thus, I perceive in the need he has of devoting himself to a task in which, above all, he can employ his intellectual capacities, the most obvious characteristic quality of the cultivated man of our times.*

The following are the mental advantages which are usually found in connection with this basic quality : a

constantly increasing capacity for mental concentration ; development of the ability for accurate, clear, reasoned and logical thinking and for objective judgment ; strengthening of will power and self-control.

An exaggeration of these qualities may lead to the following disadvantages : the possibility of losing himself in and through his work ; suppression of his erotic nature, neglect of his wife, his family and other interests ; impeding the action of the cerebral secondary functions.

We must pause for a moment to explain the last expression. It is not enough to say that what is meant by " cerebral secondary function " is, more or less, the same as what *Freud* has called the " unconscious." Although everyone, nowadays, thinks that he knows what is meant by the " unconscious," there are a very great number of people to whom the term conveys little or nothing at all.

Otto Gross, in his book : " The Cerebral Secondary Function,"¹ has compared the primary function of the brain, conscious thought, with the effect of the entire contents of the psyche, created by the sum total of all the impressions ever made upon it. This content of the psyche, of which the individual is not conscious and about which he does not think, and that can only be recalled to the memory in part, arbitrarily, or, nearly always, involuntarily, works, in fact, without the mediation of the memory, thus passing round the conscious mind. This process of the psyche is of very great importance. Although their influence, as such, is not recognized, these contents of the psyche impress their mark on *every* action and equally on all thought, feeling and desire, however momentary this may be. The effect of these total contents of the psyche, the cerebral secondary function, plays a principal part in the whole mental life and actions of mankind.

Ernst Kretschmer, following the principles enunciated by *Schilder*,² has taken an optical comparison in his " Medical

¹ Published by F. C. W. Vogel, Leipzig, 1902.

² " On Thought Development," *Neurological and Psychiatric Review*, Vol. 59.

Psychology,"¹ which puts this question before us particularly clearly. I take the following lines from his exposition : " The idea of the conscious mind means something mentally quantitative, that is to say, the greater or less definiteness of what has been experienced. When we speak of ' complete consciousness,' we mean something clear and distinct ; in ' unconsciousness ' (better, weakly conscious) we visualize indistinct, feeble and confused experience. This condition of things is best expressed by an optical simile where we speak of the ' lightness ' and ' darkness ' of conscious things.

" We can best understand the mental degree of consciousness by comparing it with the visual field of the eye. In the centre is the ' visual point of consciousness,' a small zone where everything is clear and precise, and then the much more extensive ' visual field of consciousness,' which lies in circles of ever decreasing clearness round the visual point, and merges almost indefinitely near the border, without any accentuated points, into nothingness, into the absolutely unconscious, and loses itself in the unknown. The periphery of the field of consciousness, we term ' the sphere.' By mental processes occurring in ' the sphere,' we understand those that take place on the borderland of the field of consciousness in a dark and confused way.

" We can deduce much from incidents in dreams, that occur even during ordinary waking life in the ' sphere,' on the borderland of the conscious mind, that is to say, in those mysterious, ' rolling ' regions whence all thought, particularly intuitive, productive and artistic thought, draws its inspiration. The dream processes show us the stages of incomplete thought that precede uniform, abstract and logically ordered thinking, and this supplies the elements, without which thought itself would be non-existent.

" Creative and talented men, particularly artists and poets, have never ceased to draw an analogy between the origin of their reproductive efforts and the dream world, so that we may consider this connection as an axiom. The favourable atmosphere for the development of these talents is mental twilight, when the consciousness becomes obscured, when the

¹ Published by Georg Thieme, Leipzig (3rd edition), 1926.

concentration of the mind on external things is diminished, a state of 'preoccupation' combined with hypnotic hyper-concentration on a single narrow point, forgetting space and time, removed from logic and will, an entirely passive experience, generally of a sensuous, imaginative character. . . .

"Only the unformed or half-formed malleable mental material is productive ; the logical conclusion is seen clearly defined, but it is no longer so alive of itself. Thus, too great mental clarity and logical awareness often kill creative mental effort, which prospers best on the borderland of the conscious."

This applies not only to artistic work in general but also to scientific discoveries and to all the greater business undertakings.

The danger referred to above, that the essentially useful cerebral secondary functions may be obstructed in their action by all too great concentration on the primary functions of the brain, is now clearly seen. It is equally obvious, however, that the cerebral secondary functions, important and indeed indispensable as they are for the achievement of any mental work approaching the front rank, must, when a task requiring exactness and accuracy has to be accomplished (as, for example, in science or business), be controlled to the necessary degree by primary thought.

In short : the primary and secondary cerebral functions—thought in the narrower sense of the word and intuition—must be equally balanced in the mind. The material to be dealt with determines the position of the dividing line. It is one of the faculties of man—associated with the basic quality above mentioned, and brought into being in the natural course of events and by individual development—to be able to keep this line in its correct position, and to prevent either of the two functions from dominating the other.

Masculine action and aggressiveness, masculine will to power and masculine mental concentration on work—or whatever serious pursuits replace this—usually involve a

certain amount of ambition (striving after success), which may advance him in life, but which, if he cannot control it, may seriously injure his prospects.

These particular qualities necessarily lead to a certain ego-centricity which is typical of the masculine mind.

That this ego-centricity, as well as the qualities and tendencies connected with it, are not acquired only during the development of the individual, but are also, equally in a lesser degree, inherited, may be easily observed in children. This may be noticed in early childhood in boys, long before education has had any influence on them in this respect. They wish for a rifle or a sword, are eager to fight and to measure their strength against others; their ambition is to be a general, a coachman, or a tram conductor, or, indeed, to have any position that gives them power over others. They watch carefully how their toys work, for they wish to construct, to create. But, above all, their thoughts are always centred in themselves, in their own ideas and interests.

Even if man's ego-centricity very often turns into egotism, it is, nevertheless, of the greatest use to him in the struggle for existence. For, if he were not guided by these instincts towards his chosen goal—and the real man always wishes to achieve greater and greater things—he would invariably stray from the path. Not only would he allow himself to be led into by-paths by others, but he would indeed incur the danger of deserting even those side tracks and going into the wilderness. His ego-centricity protects him from this. The repeated and ever more emphatic warning that he is on the wrong path is usually apparent to him early in life, although sometimes—for example, when love has knocked at the door—it is later. His very egotism leads him back to the high road, *his* road, and points out to him another way to his goal, if he has wandered too far. Far more men would be ruined by their sexual impulses if this quality did not protect them.

Ego-centricity makes man fall back upon himself, that is the main spring of this quality. It is this that makes him

a solitary being. And, being alone, means, in the end, to feel lonely for a longer or shorter time. No one, not even the mentally strongest man, is spared this. Weakness? Well, it may be so called. But I have never met a single man who had not this weakness. If all goes well, he can usually conquer such a feeling in a short time. During a period of depression, however, whether its origin is physical or mental, the feeling of loneliness can cause him much suffering. Happy is the man who can number among his acquaintances a real friend, to whom he can turn and unburden his mind. But this is rarely the case. For how many people have the courage and are indeed capable of telling their innermost thoughts without exaggeration, openly and frankly? Where is the friend to be found who will listen to everything with sympathy and understanding, who will forgive all and inspire fresh courage; who will submerge his own ego-centricity for a time and who will not allow such a difficult confession to be disturbed by his own ego? For the more famous the man, the more his friendship is worth having, but, therefore, usually the greater his ego-centricity.

And so the lonely man turns to woman.

If his mother is alive, the time will come when he will turn to her. She will comfort him and both will be happy in that moment.

A woman older than himself, with motherly instincts, will also give him the feeling of protection and peace, and, in addition to this, he can speak to her as to a friend. The man who has experienced such a friendship will be grateful for it all his life. Such friendships are, however, rare.

Apart from the higher, transcendental comfort of religion and philosophy, man is dependent on the help of the woman who stands nearest to him. The woman to whom he would infinitely rather turn than to his mother or his friend, the wife to whom he tries to unbear his soul, in spite of everything.—And yet, "Who can wholly understand how far apart the souls of man and woman are from each other?"

CHAPTER IV

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MASCULINE AND FEMININE

SECOND PART

Feminine Characteristics. Emotional Capacity

WHAT shall we call the principal characteristic of Woman ? For many centuries, there was no doubt about this.

But now that millions of women are forced, by circumstances, to sublimate or suppress their natural feelings : when, in addition to this, the neglect of the emotional side of life, which can be observed in a relatively small number of " fashionable women," has begun to influence women as a whole to such an extent that they suppress their feminine feelings in their desire to follow the fashion, and to obtain all the pleasure they can from life ; now, indeed, when we see men—not in any great numbers and, generally speaking, people with shallow minds, but who, nevertheless, have considerable influence and a host of willing imitators in certain circles—who seem to be contaminated by this attitude of mind, inasmuch as they are attracted by preference to degenerate or apparently degenerate women : it is no longer possible, at the present time, to consider the natural as a matter of course (in speaking of this " principal characteristic," I mean the maternal quality).

In the same way as we have dealt with man, we shall attempt logically to show what mental qualities, by reason of natural, biological and physiological peculiarities, are characteristic of woman.

Here, too, we shall take as the starting point of our considerations, the primary sexual element, this time in a double connection. First of all, we shall take the ovum as being the feminine elementary characteristic—which we

began to discuss at the beginning of the last chapter. We shall describe its most notable peculiarities, and, proceeding from this, will specify such similar qualities in the fully-developed woman.

Subsequently (and to some extent simultaneously), we shall investigate those specifically feminine characteristics diffused by the ovum, as a germ cell of a new generation, in the woman, from which another ovum is again and again endlessly produced.

What makes the greatest impression on the reader who has not studied natural philosophy, of a description like that of *Heringa* and *Lohr*? It is the powerful shock caused by the penetration of the spermatozoä into the previously static substance of the ovum; a shock that has been described by *Bachoven*, in the following words: "There is calm and peace in the ovum, but when, driven by the lust for creation, the masculine god breaks through the shell and begins his action, everything is motion, continuous haste, potential energy, never-ending circulation."

Again and again, and everywhere, we may observe the powerful reaction of the feminine cell. It is demonstrated in the mental life of the woman by her great receptivity for all emotional feelings, and emotional capacity is thus shown to be the basic quality of the feminine psyche.

G. Heymans (Groningen) has illustrated this so convincingly in his book, "Psychology of Women," that nearly all the authors who have subsequently dealt with psychological questions of this nature take the emotional capacity of woman as the main theme of their investigations.

Woman's conceptions and ideas, her thoughts, desires and actions reveal typical traits which are in entire agreement with the characteristics of emotion in general, and can be only understood through the emotional capacity. Thus, it can be stated, without fear of contradiction, that the greater part of the feminine mind would be incomprehensible if this factor were left out of consideration (*Heymans*).

This dominant emotional capacity is expressed not only

by the force of the reactions to impressions of varying importance, but is also manifested by the multiplicity of the repercussions evoked by entirely unimportant occurrences. Thus, this factor influences the woman almost throughout her life. In the average man, emotional feelings are no more than temporary deviations from a normal state of mind, not far removed from an attitude of indifference. In the average woman, these feelings are her natural environment, in which she feels at home and which she rarely abandons, and then not without inner resistance.

She regards everything from the emotional point of view, is indifferent to nothing, unless her mind is moved more powerfully for the moment by something else. Women can very rarely consider the various opposing parts of a theoretical or practical problem together, and almost never objectively. Although they may not show it, they almost always take sides in their hearts and are, thus, very easily biassed. A woman is very seldom capable of weighing up the "for" and "against," the (relative) right and the (relative) wrong. Here, too, whatever makes more impression, drives out other considerations from her consciousness, or, at most, she ascribes a position of subordinate importance to them.

But not only do women *possess* strong emotional feelings, but *they wish to have them*. For this reason, they do not shun excitement, but rather go to meet it even if it involves mixed feelings of fear and hope. The intensity and duration of the tension, however, must not go beyond certain limits. On this is based woman's much discussed liking for forbidden fruit, as is most powerfully expressed in *Ibsen's* play: "The Lady from the Sea." But this inclination may be observed in the most trivial things, in smuggling, for example. Very few women will lose such an opportunity, not for the sake of the money involved, but just for the thrill it gives them. The need they feel for emotion, in general, is apparent in the attraction they have for dramatic scenes on the stage and in real life, the lively interest they take in sensational crimes, and, speaking generally, in the fact that actual conditions of distress, such as pity, fear and disgust, are not

entirely unpleasant to them but have a certain attraction for them.

These points are rough quotations from *Heymans'* book, in which certain feminine characteristics, based on emotion that may influence the everyday association between men and women, are explained.

We shall now proceed to the consideration of other characteristics arising from the basic quality referred to, which are of the greatest importance both for the woman herself and for her environment.

In order to have a proper conception of these qualities, of their origin and co-relation, we must first recall what was said in the previous chapter in regard to the secondary cerebral functions, bearing in mind also *Kretschmer's* observations concerning the quantitative importance of the idea of consciousness. Thus, it is not difficult to understand that the more the interest of the individual is centred on the passing moment, the contents of his mind, in comparison with all that lies about him (of which he is not clearly aware at that particular time), grow increasingly smaller. This may be expressed in the following manner: that distinctness and the range of consciousness are proportional in an inverse ratio. Applied to *Kretschmer's* conception of the concentric "sphere" of consciousness: the stronger the sympathy, attention and interest—dependent largely on the stimulus evoked—for what, at a given moment, occupies the centre of the conscious mind, the more constricted is the "sphere" of the clearly conscious, and the more the contents of the mind fall into the surrounding sphere of consciousness in which the primary cerebral function yields to the secondary.

The particularly strong susceptibility of women to mental emotions is shown by the fact (contrary to the man) that the matter of the moment absorbs their whole interest, and, thus, generally speaking, the range of the woman's conscious mind is smaller than that of the man. Psychologists who accept this as normal, consider it, therefore, to be highly probable that there is in most women, some "constriction

of the consciousness." Their point of view is confirmed in psychopathological practice, particularly by the comparison of certain hysterical symptoms with phenomena observed in normal women.

Constriction of the feminine conscious mind which, physiologically, at least, we shall not term abnormal, is opposed to what may be called an expansion of the subconscious, involving an increase in the influence of the sphere on the borderline of the unconscious. Although opinions may be divided as regards the value of such expansion for reasoned thought, nevertheless, as far as the conditions and relationships dealt with in this book are concerned, its importance, for many qualities of the feminine mind, involving as it does, the predominance of the secondary cerebral function, can hardly be exaggerated.

In regard to this point, the particular qualities that occur to my mind are tact, intuition and suggestibility.

Tact, that immensely important gift in life, bordering sometimes indeed on the miraculous, of being able to do just the right thing at the right moment, of finding the only word that correctly meets the situation ; to calm with a look, with a slight change in the tone of the voice, to comfort and spur on to action. Tact is certainly not an exclusively feminine quality, but it is, nevertheless, a typically feminine gift, having its roots in the subconscious mind, and in the sphere bordering on the unconscious, where lie the piled up treasures of experience, on which it can draw.

It is not necessary to discuss at length the influence for good, indeed, sometimes the saving power, which tact may have. At the same time, we must not forget that woman, who is a past-mistress in the art of tact, understands equally well and with unfailing certainty, just in the same way and drawing on the same source, how to wound most deeply, to give the greatest possible offence, and to cause the most terrible suffering.

Before we proceed further, a few words of explanation must be given here in connection with what was said on

page 31 on what is meant by and what we call "sub-consciousness," "unconscious," "sphere," etc.

We have seen that *Kretschmer* distinguishes between a "visual point of consciousness" and a "visual field of consciousness," which surrounds the former in circles of ever decreasing distinctness and merges almost indefinitely near the border into "nothingness, into the absolutely unconscious, into the unknown." The circumference of the field of the conscious mind he terms "the sphere," and he explains this as follows: "The expression 'sphere' introduced by *Schilder*, in a somewhat narrower sense in psychopathology, is used throughout instead of the so-called 'unconscious.' This term, owing to its incorrectness, has led to endless misunderstandings and disputes, although practically everyone is in agreement with regard to the basic empiric circumstances in fact. Whatever does not reach the conscious mind and is no longer experienced in any way, cannot be called 'of the mind,' because 'mind' is identical with direct experience. 'An unconscious mental life' is an obvious contradiction in terms. A process can only be less-conscious in the 'sphere'—and even then, it is of the mind—or beyond the conscious and then, for example, it is a physical process of the brain, in any case, no longer of the mind."

I think *Kretschmer's* objection to the use that has been made in psychology of the word "unconscious" is well founded. I entirely agree with him that such an expression as "unconscious mental life" is, in itself, a really unacceptable contradiction. It appears to me, however, to be equally undesirable to speak of the "sphere" or of "events, incidents, etc., occurring in the sphere." Such expressions will undoubtedly lead to confusion and misunderstanding (at any rate by laymen). Neither are *Kretschmer's* other expressions (visual point and visual field of consciousness) particularly useful, as far as the uninitiated are concerned.

The comparison with the field of vision of the eye

chosen by *Kretschmer*, where the circles not sharply distinguished from each other lose their distinctness in merging towards the periphery, is less employed than the symbol of the layers of the subconscious mind, lying one beneath the other, and equally indistinctly separated from each other, the lowest of which have the same unclear, indistinct and obscure character, as the furthest removed circles in *Kretschmer's* comparison (his "sphere"). Both pictures are equally typical and show equally well what I desire to express. I shall, therefore, make equal use of them when the occasion arises.

I, therefore, propose to employ the words "conscious" and "unconscious" with reference to the central parts, that is to say, the uppermost layers, where everything is clear and distinct; the near-conscious and near-consciousness, or subconscious and subconsciousness for the surrounding circles, or the lower layers, which are typified by the gradual decrease in distinctness—it might also be called an increase in obscurity.

I shall use the words limiting spheres, or limiting layers (thus spheres bordering on the unconscious), instead of *Kretschmer's* "sphere," or what is commonly known as "the unconscious." In my opinion, no objection can be made to this, even if the comparison of the layers is used in speaking of limiting spheres. As the *Mater Gloriosa* says to Gretchen in *Goethe's* "Faust": "Come, I will raise thee to higher spheres."

The real, essential "unconscious"—that is to say, the further removed circles or layers—lies beyond the regions of things actually affecting the mind. This does not, however, take away from the fact that the collective effect of the unconscious is of great influence on the mental life of every individual.

We have dealt with tact, as its importance warrants, in a separate paragraph, but it is essentially a part of one generic quality, *intuition*, which at all times and in all places has been shown to be a peculiarly feminine characteristic. We have explained that intuitive understanding of mental

processes has its basis in the near-consciousness, and in the limiting spheres, in the same way as the right thinking (intuitively), intuitive thinking by preference (compared with methodical reflection and contemplation) and that inspired feeling which tells us what something is or should be. We have also been able to understand how these processes, as a general rule, take a greater place in the life of woman than of man. We have seen that something similar occurs in the origin of great thoughts, great works of art, and thus we are in agreement with the point of view that has often been put forward that woman, in this respect, is related to the artist. We demonstrated the importance of intuition, from other points of view as well, and we can state quite frankly that a greater development of this quality is, to a certain extent, advantageous and is, indeed, sometimes of the greatest possible value to woman, for her work and for her environment.

We must, however, lay special emphasis on this "to a certain extent." If, to state a case which is of only too frequent occurrence, intuition alone is allowed to express itself, while controlling-thought, in its narrower sense, is doomed to silence, the results may be anything but favourable to those concerned.

If it is deemed necessary to emphasize the defects of a dominance of the primary function, when speaking of the relationship between the primary and secondary cerebral functions in the man, it is all the more essential to draw attention to the far greater dangers, if the reverse be true.

Suggestibility (the capacity of being influenced or acted upon by suggestion), no more than the two qualities we have just discussed, is found to be an exclusive characteristic of woman. On the contrary, all human beings, indeed, it might be said, all reasoning beings, possess this quality. If we agree with this, it may also probably be applied to those beings that are not considered to possess "intelligence."

One human being is much more easily influenced by suggestion than another. One man is stronger than another, one woman than the other. Most men are stronger than most women, but, generally speaking, woman is much more

receptive to such influences than man. This is a well-known experience of daily life. It is also the result of innumerable medical examinations, of repeated experimental psychological investigations, and of many thousands of observations made, sometimes with and sometimes without the help of hypnosis. In the light of our previous statements, this may be adequately explained theoretically.

We all know how important the influence of the thought of one human being is on another, and we also know that the effect of this may be favourable or unfavourable. No lengthy explanation is necessary, therefore, to show that the great receptivity to such influences, which we find in women, is not only of importance as far as her own feelings and thoughts are concerned, but also in regard to her reactions and to her attitude towards her environment, that is to say, first and foremost, towards her husband.

Thus the suggestibility of the married couple, in particular, however, the great measure of suggestibility characteristic of the woman, is an important factor as far as conjugal relationships are concerned.

It must be borne in mind that this receptivity for suggestive influences may be turned to account in preventing hostility in marriage, and in promoting married happiness.

We shall now turn our attention to feminine characteristics, closely allied to emotion, and we shall take *impulsiveness* to begin with.

An impulse is a short, powerful shock, having a stimulating effect, and the word "impulsiveness" means exceptional mental sensibility towards such stimuli. But it also means that the person to whom this quality is ascribed does not only readily become conscious of these stimuli, but reacts to them particularly rapidly and strongly. Further, the desire for action evoked by such stimulus, very often to perform certain definite actions, is, in some way, irresistible.

If, in spite of this, the primary cerebral function maintains its ascendance, this impulsive quality may be advantageous. The impulsive man is spurred on to undertake some new duty with greater enthusiasm than the man who lacks

impulse, and if he is suddenly called upon to carry out some unexpected task which has to be finished quickly, he will perform it with greater audacity, at any rate, if the work interests him. In particular cases also, when there are no inhibitions whatsoever, when the reaction to an impulse takes place entirely outside the conscious mind of the individual, this trait can give valuable results, or, more especially, may lead to achievements, which are of peculiar attraction, because of their spontaneity. The action of a man who, for example, saves the life of another from sudden danger at the risk of his own, comes under this category, or in cases when one is reminded of Cyrano de Bergerac's phrase: "A splendid gesture." Nevertheless, such actions are far away more often performed by women, although they may not be so exaggerated in their nature.

Obviously, such "uncontrolled" expressions of impulsiveness may be injurious rather than helpful. For there is an evident disproportion between the risks to one's own life and the danger from which another is to be rescued—and thus, unbridled impulsiveness sometimes amounts to a kind of attractive folly. Cyrano's gesture, however magnificent it may be, contains much of this characteristic. We can see examples of feminine impulsiveness which are in themselves of no great importance, in the way that many women yield to a sudden temptation to buy a certain article they see in a shop window, which they do not need at all. These are trivial little follies that may be a cause of annoyance, if they occur again and again, and be injurious as well (I mean, here, only mentally injurious).

We must also bear in mind the possibilities for harm which may be caused by impulsiveness, for this quality is repeatedly found in association with a tendency to more or less violent emotional storms (anger, etc.) for which there is no sufficient reason; and, thus, "bad blood" is made between the husband and wife.

The capacity for being affected by emotion, that is to say, *susceptibility* to violent emotional feeling, and the tendency to allow such feelings to have full rein, is, like

impulsiveness, which is very closely allied to it, a typical feminine trait. This is proved by everyday experience, and is based on the idea that both these characteristics are determined by the same basic quality: the emotional capacity.

Is it necessary to explain that where the emotional feelings are predominant, and where impulsiveness and susceptibility are the deciding factors, we very often find *variability*? It is primarily expressed in changes of mood, and also in the desire always to see, to hear and to experience something different. Thus, it is the call for variety.

Changes of mood, so often seen in women, do not come about, however, because of their emotional natures. It depends largely on the sensitive equilibrium that may be observed in all the functions of the feminine organism. We have explained this in detail in "Ideal Marriage," and we shall return to it in the next chapter. At present, however, we shall deal with the significance, usually unfavourable, of these changes of mood as far as harmony in marriage is concerned.

Unfortunately, this is almost equally true of the desire for variety, a fact which is an apparent contradiction to woman's conservative tendencies in general. In any case, both these qualities have their bases in the emotional nature, which, on the one hand, magnifies the emotional capacity of the thoughts, owing to the peculiarly intense reactions of similar feelings, experienced previously, and which have been lying dormant in the "limiting layers" (borderland of consciousness), but, on the other hand—as we already know—is for ever desiring fresh, preferably violent stimuli.

Feelings of duty and reason keep this tendency within reasonable bounds among the great majority of women. It cannot be denied, however, that we are living in times when an increasing number of women so hate the very idea of duty (if they have ever possessed it at all, which is, in fact, true of many modern girls) that they are furious if the subject is mentioned in their presence. It is equally true to say that such women employ their intelligence (which is sometimes by no means to be despised) in seeking for the "variety," the distractions and the thrills they crave.

It is obvious where all this leads to. We shall not con-

sider the question of who is to blame now. This is not the task of a man writing about such questions, still less when we see that men, instead of protecting the "woman" from this, have aided and abetted, and indeed hastened on, this process of degeneration partly owing to their own decadence, but far more often owing to their deluded ideas and lack of understanding.

I will only mention one result of this, which far more often leads to gradual estrangement between two people, whose love for each other meant everything to them at one time, than is generally imagined.

It is not only boredom that sometimes estranges two human beings who live together, because they have no more to say to one another, or have no more experience from one another. Far more often it is the boredom of the woman alone that impels her repeatedly and increasingly to seek for variety and excitement, and to use her husband as a means to this end. If he yields, entirely to her wishes, his own essential qualities must suffer more and more—that is to say, if he is a man, in the real meaning of the word. Apart from this, the time when the boredom of woman must gain the upper hand—a point that is bound to be reached, because in life, the possibilities for variety and the desire for it cannot keep pace with each other—is only postponed by such means, and, finally, the man will come to hate, in the full meaning of the word, the woman who has prevented him, in such a way, from carrying out his work.

If he does not yield to her wishes, she makes him responsible for her boredom; and, in this case, the hostility originates on her side.

And so, unless mutual understanding saves the situation, the end will be, at best, that mournful resignation which is the subject of the final verses quoted here, of *Paul Geraldys'* poem: "Toi et moi":

"Come stay!
Yes, stay,
We can but try, still to endure.
Who knows, although our hearts have changed indeed,
They yet may echo love of long ago?

" What we can do, we'll do, 'tis well ;
 What is the use of speaking ?
 We're grown accustomed.
 Come, sit by me, in your despondency,
 And, in my loneliness, I'll stay with you."

French Original :

" . . . Allons, reste !
 Qui, reste, va ! On tâchera de s'arranger.
 On ne sait pas. Nos cœurs, quoiqu'ils aient bien changé,
 Se reprendront peut-être au charme des vieux gestes.
 On fera son possible. On sera bon. Et puis,
 On a beau dire, au fond, on a des habitudes. . . .
 Assieds-toi, va ! Reprends près de moi ton ennui,
 Moi près de toi je reprendrai ma solitude."

CHAPTER V

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MASCULINE AND FEMININE

SECOND PART

Feminine Characteristics (Continuation). Vulnerability and Plasticity

"THERE is calm and peace in the ovum but when the masculine God, impelled by the lust for creation, breaks through the shell. . . ."

"Breaks through the shell . . ." breaks through the wall of the ovum—thus injuring the feminine elementary material.

What takes place with the ovum is again the symbol of a quality which is typical of woman throughout her life, or, at any rate, during the period of sex maturity.

In calling this quality "Vulnerability," it must be clearly understood that the term is only employed for lack of a better, and because we do not wish to have to use long and tedious phrases.

Vulnerable means something that is capable of being injured or damaged. But, in using the word vulnerability here, we do not mean only that an individual on whom an impression is made is capable of being injured, but also that such a person is particularly liable to be injured in this way.

Thus we may say that man is sometimes vulnerable during the course of his life, in that he is a human being, and therefore the extent of his resistance to mental injuries or disease is limited, and so he too is exposed to these injurious influences. Man's "occasional vulnerability" is shown clearly by statistics relating to wounding, illness and mortality, particularly when compared with similar statistics regarding the "occasional vulnerability" of women, which are

markedly lower, for the obvious reason that a woman is far less likely to be exposed to such injuries.

As compared with woman's relatively insignificant "occasional vulnerability," she is physiologically sensitive to a high degree—a characteristic entirely lacking in the man—but which is rooted in the very being of the woman. (We shall usually call this "sensitiveness" for the sake of brevity.) The reason for this is that the essentially and specifically feminine processes of life expose the woman to injuries which, although they may be perfectly natural and normal physiological events, must, nevertheless, be regarded in a great measure as real physical injuries.

An injury similar to that caused by the penetration of the ovum by the masculine element, having its effect from outwards, inwards, occurs in defloration, which is also the result of connection with the masculine.

In the reverse direction, inwards, outwards, other injuries are caused, the most serious of which, the birth shock (trauma), is again a result of connection with the man. Without this connection and, to a certain extent, if it fails in its effect—if impregnation does not take place—injuries, having an inwards, outwards action, arise, seen during the ovulation and menstruation.

Wilhelm Liepmann has dealt with these problems in two important works,¹ and has very rightly characterized the process, which takes place every time the ovum separates from the ovary, as a typical example of feminine "vulnerability." This is his term for what we call sensitiveness. In fact, the exterior tissues that have become more delicate owing to the gradual growth of the Graafian follicles, burst in ovulation, as a result of which blood flows out towards the follicle cavities. Sometimes slight external hæmorrhage (in this case in the abdominal cavity) may be observed, although in certain exceptional cases there is considerable hæmorrhage, while the whole process leaves scar formations on the outward portion of the ovum. Accordingly, such

¹ "Psychology of Woman" and "Gynæcological Psychotherapy," (published by Urban and Schwarzenberg, Vienna, 1922 and 1924).

scars may be seen over the whole surface of the two ovaries of a sexually mature woman.

There is no need for me to say much with regard to the injury caused by menstruation. We know, from "Ideal Marriage," that the mucous membrane of the womb prepares itself every four weeks to receive an impregnated ovum, and that if the ovum is not fertilized and dies, the mucous membrane is cast off to a great extent and only the lowest layers remain. Owing to this expulsion, external hæmorrhage takes place, which involves the mucous membrane as well, and the whole internal wall of the womb becomes literally an open wound. Although the wound may not actually be deep, it is none the less open, and may be of great importance, as it creates an entry for infectious germs.

Still more than by these local wounds, the essential sensitiveness of the woman is injured by the changes that take place in the whole organism, caused by all manner of circumstances. If these changes are, in themselves, part of the normal phenomena of life, they very often become pathological or nearly so. In addition to this, they leave the door open to real symptoms of disease. They arise from circumstances that occur only once in life (the beginning and the end of sexual maturity). Sometimes they return regularly (menstruation) and sometimes they recur only from time to time, or not at all (pregnancy, and its results).

The physiological strain put upon the body owing to the relatively great rapidity in which the woman reaches sexual maturity—a transition that makes very great demands on the organism—is not only of profound significance during the years of puberty, but very often makes itself felt long afterwards, and determines the weakness of many women's constitutions.

No less important is the great change that takes place as a result of the cessation of the ovarian function. During this period of transition, this sensitiveness is shown by various phenomena which border upon the pathological, and the demands that are made upon the adaptability of the woman in this stage of life are so great that the boundaries

are often not only crossed but are very often left far behind.

However greatly menstruation and everything that goes with it may decrease the level of the processes of life and the state of health itself every month, this has been discussed in detail in the first volume and we have no need to describe it further here.

The demands made by pregnancy, delivery, child-bed and the period of lactation are so great, and the changes that they cause in comparison with "normal existence" are so far-reaching in many ways, that they involve a complete transformation, and this is seen most clearly in the sensitiveness of woman.

The sensitiveness characteristic of woman, the example and symbol of which we have seen in physiological injury resulting from the fertilization of the ovum, is closely connected with the fluctuations in equilibrium characteristic of woman in all processes of life throughout the entire period of sexual maturity. This quality is expressed in that undulatory movement we have previously discussed in detail, and have also demonstrated by graphs. This undulatory movement, this physiological change in the intensity of life, the fluctuation in equilibrium, originates in the ovum, in its development, in its expulsion, in its influences during the period of waiting before fertilization on the inner secretion of the ovaries, and in its death if fertilization does not take place. More precisely stated, these conditions are caused by the uninterrupted production of ova.

"*Propter solum ovulum mulier est quod est.*" Sensitiveness and regular fluctuations in the equilibrium—completely disturbed by the fertilization of an ovum (which is also a physiological process)—*sensitiveness and plasticity*, these are the characteristics of the sexually mature feminine organism.

What is their significance in the mental life of the woman ?

Firstly, they possess directly mental equivalents, that is to say, that the feminine soul also is sensitive and is in a state

of plastic equilibrium. Periods in which an awakened interest, a desire for action and a feeling of power are uppermost, alternate with periods during which the mind is below the normal level.

The first mentioned phenomena occurs during the rising of the wave and at its crest ; and the latter when the wave begins to sink, particularly just before menstruation, during the period of hæmorrhage itself, and, further, quite frequently at the lowest point of the wave, if this is particularly marked. Many women, who are otherwise active, healthy and cheerful, become depressed and moody during the "low" period, and are generally nervous and excitable. Irritability, hypersensitiveness, capriciousness and frequent changes of mood, incompatibility, and a tendency to quarrel easily are symptomatic of these phases (by no means during menstruation only) in many women who are otherwise quite different. (See Chapter VI. of "Ideal Marriage," which explains the importance of the climateric and menopause as far as the psyche is concerned.)

Liepmann considers the capacity for emotion to be the result of "vulnerability." The arguments for and against this opinion cannot be discussed here, for the time spent in their consideration would be of no practical value, and would not advance us further in our comprehension of the nature of these matters. So much, however, can be taken as certain, that the emotional capacity, sensitiveness and the plastic mental equilibrium are very closely associated with each other, and, therefore, all the qualities we have spoken of here are inter-connected. I believe, indeed, that all mental qualities typical of man or woman may be traced back to the characteristic masculine and feminine principles of energy, which we observed at the beginning of our investigations regarding the existence of a mental sexual difference—kinetic energy and tension energy—active force and creative force.

Such a digression from our main theme is, no doubt, profitable, as it helps us to gain an insight into the causes for that difference. Our purpose, however, is to endeavour

to understand that contrast in its bearing on practical life—it is the final object of the book, and I think it advisable, therefore, not to proceed to such a minute examination of the particular mental qualities appertaining to both sexes.

We shall, therefore, investigate the qualities produced by feminine sensitiveness and plasticity, based exclusively on the sexual functions and, in particular, on the generation of the ova and the processes associated with it.

From the period of puberty onwards, the woman is more or less aware of this sensitiveness and plasticity, so typical of her body and mind. If, at first, it is only a vague premonition it gradually becomes more and more tangible—even if the woman will not admit this—and causes a certain feeling of inferiority. If this feeling has not been inherited (that this is so can hardly be doubted) or has not been impressed on the girl by her experiences in childhood, it appears in connection with the first menstruation and particularly in the period following it. And this ever-recurrent period, always bringing feelings of discomfort and decreased efficiency with it, materially increases the consciousness of inferiority.

In short, woman regards, sometimes less, but usually more acutely, her vulnerability and plasticity to be a short-coming, a defect, or a weakness. Although, generally speaking, she may not be conscious of this, her feelings, in this respect, are somewhat similar to those of the hunchback or the cripple.

It is a well-known fact that persons afflicted in any particular way tend to devote special care to the defective member, and to occupy their thoughts uninterruptedly with matters concerning it (*Adler*). On the other hand, they try, with a certain suspicious fear, to prove to themselves that their defect is noticed by others and that they are, therefore, ignored because of it—even when this is really not the case.

We may observe similar symptoms in women regarding their sensitiveness and plasticity. A feeling of inferiority (inferiority complex) appears which is cultivated, very often

purposely exaggerated and exhibited systematically. At the same time, she has the feeling that she is being put in the background by those about her, particularly by men, and the reactions arising from this are inevitable.

Such an emotional complex is best described by the French word used by *Nietzsche* in his "Genealogy of Morals": "*ressentiment*" (resentment). We understand by this a certain grudge, largely paramount in the minds and dominant in the attitude to life of those who, rightly or wrongly, think that they have not had a fair chance in life, a feeling produced by jealousy and inferiority. It is the narrow point of view, the gnawing, incessant feeling of concealed internal revolt; the typical feeling of the weak towards the strong, the poor towards the rich, the ugly towards the beautiful, and the sick, decadent, and failing towards healthy youth. This is associated with the tendency so to distort things that weakness and poverty are proclaimed to have a higher ethical value.

Resentment is the mainspring of the idealist as of the lowest possible motives, depending on the way we look at it. Here, however, we shall simply consider resentment as a mental phenomenon. The moral philosophy of civilized peoples has arisen to a large extent owing to the fact that the great mass of the weak, roused to anger, opposed the small number of their oppressors. The oppressed, whose lot in the struggle for existence was defeat, rose against the powers that ruled at their cost. Highly talented individuals who experienced suffering themselves, who were themselves poor or ill or hypersensitive, found words to express their sympathy with those who suffered with them and, thereby, produced entirely new ideas of Society. Resentment and pity have, in the history of civilization, in particular periods of development, almost always led to complete transvaluation. Further, they have produced a blind ethical preference, bordering sometimes on the perverse, for the mentally deficient, the hungry and neglected, for beggars and the sick, for dirt, rags and disease; and, at the same time, depreciation of strenuous healthy work, with the result that such an enormous number of parasites were brought

into being that they became a real national pest towards the end of the Middle Ages.

Behind pity and altruistic ethics, we can observe the open or disguised envy or hatred of the small towards the great ; the desire to besmirch the beautiful, to drag the glorious in the dust, or, at any rate, to keep secure where one is not capable of rising to similar heights, by pin pricks and petty vindictive actions. The will to power, the striving to rise to higher things, can be seen even in these small actions. In strong natures, we observe the open *fight for power* which is entirely self-reliant, and despises all social scruples. In the development of the history of civilization, which, as is well known, proceeds in sharply defined contrasts, the struggle for power, the individualistic "Master morality," has been proclaimed as a new doctrine at various times, as a protest against the growth of altruistic ethics (*Nietzsche*).

It is typical of *Nietzsche's* character that he felt so strongly that antithesis and resentment were elements of altruistic ethics, that, as opposed to this, he could in no way recognize in such a theory what the average man finds out by himself: unaffected goodwill, humanity, kindness of man to man, which can even induce the strong to protect and help the weak, simply because it gives him pleasure.

The psychology of neurosis affords in many ways an interesting comparison of this struggle for power between the victors and the vanquished. Thus, for example, hysterical behaviour is only a minor but often successful method used by the weakly equipped, nervous individual, to rise in spite of unequal advantages and, finally, to win the victory over the intelligence, and power at the command of his healthy and strong opponent.

Occasionally, a certain compensating justice is found in neurotic family relationships of such a nature, but often also the bitterest irony. Resentment and struggle for power are clearly to be observed in the way in which a hysterical child tyrannizes over its parents by convulsions and outbursts of

rage, or in the way in which the cold, pleasure-loving wife makes a healthy man her slave by her "attack," or that fainting fit, which is always produced at the right moment. Hysterical neurosis is frequently nothing more than the continued struggle for power carried on by other methods. We sometimes see cool calculations in all this, but, perhaps more commonly, the feelings of resentment are located in the borderland spheres of the unconscious mind. They are diffused and lie hidden in the depths of the mind, and the neurotic reactions arising from them are instinctive or semi-instinctive, just as are the reactions of self-defence and self-protection observed in small hunted animals. Only that meaning smile, that flits involuntarily over the features of so many hysterical women when they "produce their scenes," betrays the secret triumph of the weak over the strong.

Resentment that we have described here in broad outlines, according to *Kretschmer's* point of view, results, among many women, from their vulnerability and plasticity, and does not only produce a feeling of inferiority, but does, in fact, make most women physiologically inferior for the great part of their lives.

We will not speak, at the moment, of the very great social influence which feminine resentment and struggle for power, in addition to the other phenomena of this period, has had during the last fifty years. We shall confine ourselves exclusively to the consideration of its importance for the individual and his environment—in this case, for the husband.

But this problem of resentment must not absorb our entire interest, even although it may be one of the main causes of hostility in marriage. The feeling of being vulnerable and plastic—a feeling which is enhanced to no small extent by the thought of pregnancy and everything connected with it—has an entirely different effect. It awakens in woman the desire for protection, for the support of the stronger, who, in the nature of things, is the man.

First, because his powers of thought and action are not prejudiced by physiological vulnerability and plasticity.

Further, because the man, unlike the woman, is not obstructed in his primary cerebral function by a constriction of the conscious mind, and because the secondary function dominant in the woman instinctively desires a compromise.

And again, because the man, owing to his smaller emotional capacity, is able more vigorously to resist momentary impressions.

Finally, because the protective part played by the man lies in the nature of things. He has been woman's protector throughout the ages, and has looked after her and her children.

It is easily understood that the man from whom the woman desires support shall be, wherever possible, her husband. For the love that binds them together, and the interest they have in common, create that essential atmosphere of mutual trust, of taking and giving, of protection and support. Therefore, the woman's position of dependence on her husband is more definitely not that of the oppressed to the oppressor—as is maintained by certain people—but the position of the woman seeking the protection and support of the man from whom she expects that support and protection—relationship that has to be, owing to the sexual characteristics peculiar to her.

Some writers see in these sexual characteristics the elements of a "biological tragedy of woman" (*Nemilow*). We must, however, bear in mind that, although this expression appears to hit the mark and thus clings to the memory, it is, nevertheless, quite false in fact, because, from a biological point of view, the basis of the tragic and, therefore, the tragedy itself, simply does not exist. The basis of tragedy entails, briefly, the destruction of important mental concepts, particularly in the sphere of the beautiful and the noble, resulting from the effect of opposing forces, while, in particular, the tragedy is intensified by the existence of "guilt."

But the biological facts of a woman's life are, not sufficient in themselves, to form the materials of tragedy, and there is absolutely no reason to consider them "from a tragic

point of view." The worries, troubles and dangers involved by being a woman are counterbalanced by just as many opportunities for happiness, so that it is entirely wrong to pity the woman because of her biological characteristics, and still more absurd to lead her to believe that she is an object of pity. Both these ideas have wrought untold harm. The inferiority of woman (as compared with the average human being), in one respect, is opposed to her superiority in other ways; the inferior primary cerebral function to the superior secondary function; the smaller understanding, in the narrower meaning of the word, to the greater capacity for intuitive knowledge; the disadvantage of emotional feeling to the advantages of a deeper interior life; the sexual inferiority, arising from her characteristic vulnerability and plasticity, to a superiority exclusively the possession of the feminine sex, the far more important quality of motherhood.

In spite of all this, although vulnerability and plasticity may not form the basis of a "biological tragedy," the feelings of dependence and inferiority produced by them are of great significance in the origin of internal and external conflicts—thus, tragic situations. Together with certain closely interconnected peculiarities of the mind, they may form the basis of "a psychological tragedy of woman" ("psychological tragedy" is not entirely and certainly not in every case a pleonasm), fulfilling all the requirements we have just shown to be essential for tragedy.

Thus we reach the essence of the problem relating to the origin of hostility in marriage. If the man does not put an end to this psychological tragedy of woman in time, it may develop into the supreme type of psychological marriage tragedy.

But enough of symbols and comparisons. This is the truth of the matter:

AS A RESULT OF CHARACTERISTIC SEXUAL QUALITIES (IN PARTICULAR AS A RESULT OF HER PHYSIOLOGICAL VULNERABILITY AND PLASTICITY) THE WOMAN IS DEPENDENT ON

THE MAN FOR PROTECTION AND SUPPORT. SHE DEMANDS THIS SUPPORT—CONSCIOUSLY OR UNCONSCIOUSLY. SHE NOT ONLY ACCEPTS, BUT DESIRES THE DEPENDENCE INVOLVED BY THIS, BECAUSE HER HIGHLY DEVELOPED INTUITIVE FEELING TELLS HER THE REASONS FOR THIS DEPENDENCE ARE BASED ON NATURAL (BIOLOGICAL) CAUSES.

DEPENDENCE IS ALWAYS CONNECTED WITH SUBMISSION, AND THE DESIRE FOR THE ONE INVOLVES THE OTHER. IN ADDITION TO THIS, NUMEROUS POWERFUL INFLUENCES MAKING FOR SUBMISSION TO THE MAN ARE PRESENT IN SEXUAL CONNECTION, AS FAR AS THE WOMAN IS CONCERNED, SO THAT THE DESIRE FOR THIS CONNECTION, THE SEXUAL IMPULSE, IS ASSOCIATED IN THE WOMAN WITH A TENDENCY TO SUBMIT HERSELF.

FOR THESE TWO REASONS, THEREFORE, IT IS UNDERSTANDABLE THAT THE WILL TO POWER THAT WE HAVE RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE STRONGEST IMPULSES—AND ONE WHICH IS PARTICULARLY INCLINED TO REVERSAL—IS FELT BY THE WOMAN IN THE DEPTHS OF HER BEING, PRIMARILY IN THE REVERSED AND NEGATIVE SENSE. FROM THIS COMES THE DESIRE FOR SUBORDINATION, PARTICULARLY FOR SUBMISSION TO THE MAN.

NEVERTHELESS, AND HERE THE STRUGGLE BEGINS, THE WILL TO POWER APPEARS IN EVERY HUMAN RELATIONSHIP (TO CONFINE OURSELVES TO HUMAN BEINGS): FIRST OF ALL IN A POSITIVE SENSE, SO THAT A STRUGGLE FOR MASTERY TAKES PLACE BETWEEN TWO HUMAN BEINGS UNTIL ONE OF THEM GAINS THE ASCENDANCY, OR UNTIL (USUALLY TACITLY) A FINAL SETTLEMENT HAS BEEN REACHED. THIS SETTLEMENT IS RELATIVELY RARE IN A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ONE MASCULINE AND TWO FEMININE INDIVIDUALS, AND IS INDEED VERY RARE IN MARRIAGE. THEN THE WOMAN IS, PERHAPS AS A RESULT OF HER EMOTIONAL TEMPERAMENT, LESS EASILY INDUCED TO COME TO A COMPROMISE. SHE DESIRES EITHER POWER OR SUBJUGATION. SHE DESIRES SUBMISSION WITH HER WHOLE SOUL AND BEING, BUT SEEKS TO GAIN POWER. SHE HERSELF, SOONER OR LATER, (USUALLY, HOWEVER, FROM THE VERY FIRST), BEGINS THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER, AND, IF SHE WINS THE

VICTORY, SHE LOSES THE VERY THING THAT SHE MOST NEEDS, THE PROTECTION AND SUPPORT OF THE MAN. EVEN ALTHOUGH THIS MAY NOT PENETRATE HER CONSCIOUSNESS, AND MAY BE EXPLAINED BY THE RESENTMENT ENGENDERED BY PHYSIOLOGICAL INFERIORITY, IT IS NONE THE LESS TRAGIC. VERY FEW WOMEN ARE CLEVER OR WISE ENOUGH TO PERCEIVE THE CONNECTION BETWEEN ALL THESE THINGS, AND ARE, CONSEQUENTLY, ABLE TO WITHSTAND THE TEMPTATION TO CARRY ON THIS STRUGGLE. ONLY THOSE HAPPY DISPOSITIONS (WHOSE CHARACTER RECALLS GOETHE'S MOTHER¹) WHO INSTINCTIVELY AVOID EVERY DISSENSION THEY POSSIBLY CAN ARE SPARED THIS CONFLICT WHICH MAY DEVELOP INTO A FEMININE PSYCHOLOGICAL TRAGEDY.

If the man has enough strength of mind to oppose this successfully, if he has wits enough not to be imposed upon by modern slogans, to see behind their usually unpleasant glamour, is able to understand the real nature of woman unfalteringly, and does not wound in the process; if he possesses enough love, tact and self-control to carry out this defensive contest without causing unnecessary injury, and if he is capable, by his steadfastness, of persuading his wife in time of the fruitlessness of further attempts to gain dominance—he will then have arrested the course of the tragedy. If not, it will take its course, to the injury of both. We all know the game, “who loses, wins.” The winner loses and the loser wins in that game. *Here*, likewise, the woman who wins the game of the struggle for power, loses. Only if the man carries off the prize can both husband and wife win. If the woman wins, then both lose. The man loses much, but his work remains to him and he can make this a substitute. But the woman loses *everything* in her victory.

And because she feels that the man should have proved himself to be the stronger; to the resentment evoked by her physiological inferiority and to all the bitter feelings arising from the loss of the desired support, and the irreparable damage caused by this, she adds rancour towards the man

¹ See Chapter XIII, quotation from one of her letters.

who has allowed himself to be conquered by her, and she despises him in her inmost soul.

The dependence of the woman on the man, and, in consequence, his supremacy in marriage and in Society, is based on biological and natural facts.

Even the work of the *Vaertings*,¹ which is interesting but very biassed, and, for this reason, unconvincing, cannot alter this. We must admit that this supremacy has led to oppression of women by men, and it is equally certain that laws which do grave injustice to women and which must be repealed, the sooner the better, have proceeded from this.

The oppression of women by men must cease absolutely. This is not only a just demand but also sound common sense, which aims at making the greatest possible use of all human powers, of men and women equally, to reduce the amount of suffering in the world as far as is practicable, and to create the greatest measure of happiness for the greatest number. But it is ridiculous to try, as is being done increasingly by certain people, to reverse the parts played in life by man and woman.

Society is bound to suffer from this, both men and women, and, in the end, women most of all.

For, however important the social phenomena mentioned may be, they are only secondary.

If the primary processes of life, which are based on biological facts, are ignored, time will have its revenge.

One cannot assault Nature with impunity.

¹ *Dr. Mathilde Vaerting* and *Dr. Matthias Vaerting*. "The Feminine Nature in the Man-World" and the "Male Nature in the World of Women" (G. Braun, Karlsruhe, 1921); and "Truth and Error in the Psychology of the Sexes" (*Ibidem*, 1923).

CHAPTER VI

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MASCULINE AND FEMININE

SECOND PART

Feminine Characteristics (Continuation)—Maternal Instinct

“PROPTER solum ovulum,” etc.

This has been repeated often enough. Nevertheless, the quotation must be mentioned first and foremost in any examination of the most important of all feminine qualities. The woman is what she is owing to the one single fact : that she produces the ova, shelters them during the period of development after impregnation, and afterwards cares for the child originating from these cells.

Her whole physical organism is centred on this primary function. Every four weeks she prepares herself by means of transformation processes in the sexual organs, and by general changes affecting metabolism and other functions, to give the impregnated ovum the best possible chance of future development. Every time the ovum dies, because impregnation has failed to take place, the organism destroys all that it has just built up, and immediately afterwards begins the whole process again. If fertilization takes place, the alteration is so radical that it can be stated that the organism exists entirely on account of the foetus during the whole period of pregnancy.

The whole matter may, therefore, without exception, be summed up in one sentence. Nature has fashioned the woman's body solely in order that she may bear children and thus preserve the species.

Can we wonder, therefore, that her whole mind is absorbed by this task, and that, just as her body is fashioned for maternity, so the mental quality dominating all others in

the woman is motherhood ? This cannot indeed be doubted, for the care of the child occupies the entire attention of the mother, even after the physical changes resulting from its conception and birth have long since disappeared and, in addition, she continues to fulfil this task (if the course of her life proceeds naturally and smoothly) when the process of bearing another child is already proceeding or has again been concluded. Works of art depicting mother love, which have been executed by many painters and by even more sculptors,¹ show us the woman in the form that corresponds best to her natural self, and, at the same time, they give us a picture of her inmost soul, even if the woman has not yet borne a child : the supreme conception of motherhood.

Work is to the man what maternity is to the woman.

This is a biological and natural necessity for her.

There is no need to dilate upon this at length. We have already given sufficient biological proofs of this here and in "Ideal Marriage" ; and the history of the mother instinct, in its broad outlines, is well enough known. Surely it is unnecessary to quote further examples from the animal world or from botany ; to mention the brooding instinct of birds or famous pictures showing the mother love of animals ? Is there any purpose in stating that the mother instinct is one of the strongest impulses among primitive races, and among primitive people belonging to the civilized races ? We know that the mother instinct breaks through with elementary force at a decisive moment even in degenerate and pleasure-loving women.

It is better to sum up the matter thus : the mother instinct is the most typical expression of the force we have observed to be the peculiar possession of women, the *forming power*, the typical elasticity of the feminine.

Long before we can speak of physical maternity, indeed, long before the sexual approach impulse makes itself felt,

¹ See, for example, "Carità," by *Andrea del Sarto* in the Louvre, where the mother is suckling her youngest child, hands fruit to another, while a third, watched over by her, lies sleeping.

the maternal instincts of the feminine individual are clearly recognizable. The little girl will look after her dolls or, when she can—if this tendency is not thwarted by jealousy—rock a baby in her arms, care for it, wash it and help to dress it, even without the influence of upbringing.

She likes best to play at being "mother," or, for a change, to perform one of those activities that grown-up people like to do if motherhood has been denied to them by fate; activities in which the feelings of motherly care for the small and weak creature are satisfied as far as possible. It may be admitted that in "playing mother" or in pretending to be a teacher, governess or a nurse, a by no means insignificant proportion of desire for power may be involved, but the chief factor, the mother instinct, is there, clearly to be seen—the desire to look after those who need such care, to surround them with maternal tenderness, and, in exchange for all this, to receive their devotion, their love and their caresses.

From puberty until the day of marriage, provided this is not too long delayed, and for some time afterwards, the mother instinct usually takes second place, because the sexual impulse, particularly questions connected with approach in all its various forms, almost entirely absorbs the mind or, in any case, the emotional sphere.

But, after a certain time has elapsed, the mother instinct reappears in the foreground, claims its rights once more and pervades henceforth—either together with the sexual impulse or indeed often dominating it—the woman's soul throughout her life.

To be a woman means to have the desire to become a mother both physically and mentally. Mentally even more than physically.

And it is well that this is so. For it is not given to every woman to have the wish for maternity fulfilled. Apart from this, on the one hand, it is absolutely impossible repeatedly to satisfy this impulse, and, on the other hand, it is associated with so much trouble in life that, generally speaking, it must be regarded as practically unattainable.

First, there is, at the present time, so great a disproportion in numbers between men and woman that, apart from other reasons, this fact alone makes it impossible for all women to marry and to have the opportunity of becoming mothers.

Some regard this state of affairs as a "Biological Tragedy of Woman." No explanation is required to show that this expression is again out of place, particularly in the light of what has already been said. The fact, however, that, owing to the great number of surplus women, many of them are denied the fulfilment of their inmost and most natural desires, is none the less depressing.

Whether, to what extent and how, it would be practically possible and desirable, as far as these women are concerned, to modify somewhat the consequences of this disproportion, by changes in our social system and ideas, must remain unanswered, for such problems are far too complex in their nature to be dealt with briefly, and a lengthy examination would be out of place here. I will merely state that, in my opinion, the problem, generally speaking, is insoluble, because, however greatly the social conditions of the unmarried mother and her children are improved, a woman will only rarely find adequate satisfaction for her natural and justifiable desires in such a position. Apart from very few cases, a woman is equally discontented for any length of time with the position of a wife of the second rank, whether this position is legalized or not (for such legislation has actually been proposed as a possible way out).

Every woman who has remained unmarried against her will has the greatest difficulty in solving the problems arising from her desire for sexual satisfaction and love. Generally speaking, unless unforeseen circumstances arise, it is true to say that she can only satisfy her mother instinct in other people's children, unless she turns the impulse in an entirely different direction.

We see this done everywhere daily, usually to the great advantage of Society and particularly of those on whom such feelings of motherhood devolve.

To proceed, we come now to those childless married women who can, as far as the mother instinct is concerned, be placed, to a large extent, together with those mentioned above, even although, as is obvious, they feel the lack of motherhood more deeply than the unmarried. If they have abandoned hope of physical maternity, they try to find another way to express their maternal feelings, by devoting themselves to the children of others or to charitable work. It is only in exceptional cases that they can concentrate more than a relatively small portion of such feelings on their husbands; and they cannot take up any profession that would give them the opportunity of satisfying their maternal impulse, either because they have had no training or because they are prevented by other reasons. Carità (maternal love) merges into charity. Is not this immensely significant?

The childless married woman has the best opportunity of suitably employing her maternal affections if she has nieces and nephews, although unmarried aunts are mostly preferred by their sisters, who have children, as they are not, as is the married woman, restricted in their freedom by their husbands, and by the cares of their own households. Speaking from this point of view, the unmarried woman is the aunt *par excellence*. It is by no means rare to see her desire to give motherly love and tenderness, and to receive a little child-like devotion in return, greatly abused. Nevertheless, this "profession" of aunt, for which unmarried women who have no real occupation are particularly suitable, considered as a profession, is usually one that is repaid with but scanty thanks from the employer, and with still less material return.

As the last group of women, in whom the possibility of satisfying the mother instinct does not correspond with the desire, we must consider the so-called "old maids."

When ovarian activity ceases (certain biologists call this the "physiological death" of a woman), the prospects of further maternity disappear at a period of life when the maternal feelings have by no means ceased to exist. Here is the best foundation for those who wish to prove the existence of "a biological tragedy of woman," although

here, too, the distinctive characteristics typical of tragedy are absent.

It is certain, however, that the woman may experience great psychological difficulties owing to this contrast, and they will be all the more acute if, as is commonly the case, the children she has brought into the world as a relatively young woman have since become independent, and she has borne more children in her later years.

It is understandable that in such circumstances the maternal feelings remain permanently concentrated on their original objects, the grown-up children. This may have very wonderful results, but may also lead to serious conflicts, both external (between mother and child) and internal. This danger really begins when a third person appears on the scene, who demands and possesses more claims to the devotion of the "child" than the mother herself. That is to say, when a son-in-law or a daughter-in-law is involved. Then the mother becomes the mother-in-law who, if she has tact and insight, can make the husband or wife of her child a new object of her motherly love, but who, if she does not possess this tact and insight, and is filled with resentment and the desire and will to power, may become the "wicked mother-in-law" of novels and the stage.

"Elderly" women can most suitably express their maternal feelings in their love for their grandchildren. This is so obvious that we can deal with the point in a few words. The tactful and sympathetic grandmother is a blessing to many families; and she herself can find in the bestowal of her mother love once more and in receiving again, after so long a time, the affection of small children, full satisfaction for her unimpaired maternal instincts and a happy memory of her youth.

A further possibility of satisfying her mother love, offered to the middle-aged woman, is to be the motherly friend of a number of young people of varying ages, to whom she can be a real tower of strength. Such women have played great and beneficial parts in the lives of many, and could do so in many more cases.

It is by no means always possible to divert maternal feelings, the natural course of which has been hindered by circumstances, into other channels of satisfaction. Very often it is impossible to find a suitable object for such affection, or, again, time and opportunity for this may be lacking. If the woman is unable to find a way of turning these feelings to practical account in her near or more remote surroundings, and if she cannot take up a profession in which she can express such instincts (nurse, governess or various types of social work) or devote herself seriously to charitable endeavour, nothing is left to her but complete sublimation. Such a course is by no means easy. Indeed, many women find it far more difficult to sublimate the mother instinct than the sexual impulse. If she does not succeed in finding something to replace these feelings, or in suppressing them, which is very rare, a sort of obsession, brooding and deep depression, or, as a consequence of repression, neurotic symptoms may be the result.

We have observed such repression previously, and we shall revert to the problem later. We shall devote a certain amount of space to repression, because it is of great significance and because it leads, in many people, to diseases of the nervous system (neuroses).

With regard to this, we shall consider, for example, what has been said by *Stekel* on the matter in his book, "Nervous Conditions of Fear." (We shall, however, only deal with his theories in broad outlines.)

The mere forgetfulness of unimportant impressions must not be confused with repression, a condition always pre-supposing a feeling of displeasure. The forgetfulness consequent upon repression is an active mental process, as opposed to ordinary forgetfulness.

In repression, the emotional capacity retains its full force (here, roughly, a mental process of such intensity that its effect cannot adequately be controlled); it is only removed from the consciousness to the near consciousness or those spheres bordering on the unconscious (displacement of the emotion). This concealment of

the emotion makes it unassailable. By *repression*, we mean an *apparent forgetfulness*, when we do not wish to think of a particular thing because of the feelings of displeasure it arouses in us. The complete repression of an event that has made a deep impression, of an impulse, of a mental image, is relatively rarely seen. The stronger the emotion, the more difficult is repression, but, if it is successful, one can speak of successful repression or *suppression*. Neurosis comes about owing to *unsuccessful repression*. The emotion is not cut off, only displaced. The symptoms are then a compromise between emotion and repression.

But suppression makes the mental material in question worthless, and, in consequence, it can never be the cause of neurosis. In contrast to *Freud*, who accepts true amnesia—"the incapability of visualising"—*Stekel* believes that in repression—which is no more than unsuccessful repression, it is a matter of "*not desiring to visualise*" a certain conception which is only driven back (displaced) from the consciousness to the borderland of the conscious mind.

In short, "suppression" means a relatively rare, completely successful repression, true forgetfulness attained by active means; and "repression," in its meaning here, only apparent forgetfulness.¹

At this point, the question may be raised whether the woman's feelings of motherhood are usually so strongly developed as has been presumed in the above arguments. We may have justifiable doubts with regard to this, for, at the present time, there are indications to show that motherhood is falling more and more into discredit.

This discredit of motherhood amongst women is, however, only apparent in its effect on the total number of children brought into the world. The average number of children now born in wedlock is unquestionably smaller than pre-

¹ *Freud*, who more than anyone else, has promoted the knowledge of these things, speaks only of successful or unsuccessful repression. Nevertheless, for ordinary use, it appears clearer to me to use the words "suppression" and "repression."

viously. This has been brought about both by the changed outlook of many people, and by the improvement in the technical resources for the prevention of pregnancy at the disposal of mankind. The number of women, nevertheless, who desire no children *in principle* is, so far as can be estimated, about the same now as it has always been.

Moreover, it is certain that there are women, and presumably always have been women, although their number may be relatively very small, who feel such a strong antagonism to motherhood that they refuse to marry for this reason, or, if they have married without sufficient reflection and only discover their aversion later on, feel the maternity that comes in the natural course of events to be a great wrong done to them by their husbands.

I have met a few such women in the course of my practice. I am not speaking here of those who are homosexually constituted, or belong to a clearly defined inter-sexual type, but "real" women with well defined feminine physical characteristics, well developed genitals, typical pelvic formation, regular menstruation, normal pregnancy, and, indeed, who have peculiarly easy confinements together with excellent lactation capacity.

In their physical qualities, they show no marked difference from other women (apart from the maternal feelings); their impulse of approach is normal, and the attraction they have for men is certainly not below the average. The component parts of the sexual impulse, which we have observed as a tension relaxation impulse, are basically the same as in most women of our race. If the man knows how to arouse her feelings in the right way, and takes these circumstances into account during the sexual act, these women, although they are not particularly temperamental in the long run, may be considered as normal in this way also, and thus as good wives. There are two conditions, however, attached to this—first, that there is no chance of pregnancy, for this fear dominates their whole sexual life, and they will, in no circumstances, allow themselves to reach orgasm if they feel there is the slightest possibility

of this taking place ; and secondly, provided that the bitterness they feel towards the man who has been the cause of a previous state of pregnancy is not uppermost in their minds.

If such a woman does become pregnant, the moral obligations towards the child, involved by this, are taken very seriously. I have never seen such a woman go to an abortionist, and I have had no trouble in making her follow any advice I may have given her in matters of hygiene in connection with her unborn child, and I have never experienced refusal to nurse the child.

This very strong feeling of duty can be explained by the fact (this is the explanation given by such women themselves) that they consider the birth of the child as a wrong done to the child itself, so that they feel themselves bound to start it in life with the best physical development possible.

The pessimistic attitude to propagation taken up by these women is all the more curious, as, apart from this, their ideas on life do not show particularly melancholy traits, and, in the cases I have seen, nothing that would have led me to suppose the existence of such a predisposition.

All the outward expressions of motherly feeling are far less developed in these women than in others, although such feelings—in contrast to the instinct of motherhood, which is entirely absent—really do exist, as has been proved again and again.

Is the lack of such an essential quality—which does not prevent them (such women are particularly well balanced and controlled) from being splendid woman, excellent wives and even mothers—to be ascribed to a certain masculine strain in their characters ? I believe this to be probable, although I am not entirely satisfied by such an explanation.

The masculine strain in women and the feminine in men will be referred to subsequently. Even if in the foregoing cases the feminine characteristics are so obvious that no one would dream of calling them “ masculine women ; ” nevertheless, these women show certain masculine qualities, such as a liking for boyish games and pranks in their youth,

(even without the influence of their brothers or their friends) associated with very little inclination to play with dolls, and a preference for masculine sports when they become adults.

I have examined this type of woman in some detail because such a mental defect in otherwise purely normal women is interesting enough in itself to warrant closer consideration. Further, I believed it necessary to emphasize the fact that the maternal instinct is not fully developed in ALL women. I repeat, however, that this is a relatively rare phenomenon.

Apart from these cases, the absence of the maternal instinct in the modern woman is really nothing but a pose. The maternal instinct exists in spite of this, although there may be only one child. It exists even in married women who, either wholly or in part, have directed the instinct into channels other than those prescribed by nature. Even if it is associated more frequently than formerly with temporary sublimation, even if it is wholly transformed, and this is rare, the mother instinct is still the most characteristic feminine quality. Anyone of average intelligence can see this for himself. Where it really is repressed, because some women think it fashionable, or because of decadence, or love of pleasure, it will also be seen that such repression has its revenge sooner or later. A more than temporary repression of the mother instinct is, practically speaking, impossible.

Maternity means to sacrifice oneself for the coming generation, and thus for others. It means to look after others, to think of others and to find one's own well-being, one's own happiness, only in the well-being and the happiness of others. To analyse this is superfluous. We see it every day in every living thing. It cannot be otherwise. It must be so. It is essential for the species, which would at once die out if its feminine members did not fulfil this demand.

Maternity transfers its own ego to the children and to the mother instinct, which can only find happiness in others,

and which desires to extend the maternal feelings, the maternal care, to everything that needs mother love, and to receive in return devotion from those who are surrounded with all this tenderness and love.

Even when the woman is an extreme egotist, and mainly thinks of her own well-being, she can only find this through others. If she rebels against this, she represses her innate mother instinct ; and if she only desires her own selfish happiness, she will not find it, for she denies her inmost being.

For *altero-centricity* is one of the chief characteristics of *woman*, just as *ego-centricity* is a basic characteristic of the *man*.

CHAPTER VII

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MASCULINE AND FEMININE

THIRD PART

Sexual Physiological Differences and their Psychological Significance

BEFORE we sum up all we have said previously in regard to masculine and feminine qualities, and compare the basic qualities of man and woman with each other, we must recapitulate first of all certain sexual physiological differences dealt with in "Ideal Marriage." For they are very significant factors in married life, and it is highly important for harmonious marriage that these differences should be recognised, and that the conclusions reached should be put into practical application. If this is not recognized, or if the husband and wife fail to take these factors into account, and do not adapt their sexual relations to the existing differences, it is often the origin of hostility in marriage. This occurs all the more easily as these differences, in contrast to those existing between the purely mental masculine and feminine qualities, are not relative but absolute.

The fact that full sexual potency (as also mental maturity) appears much later in the man than in the woman is of very little importance in the present state of civilization, as far as marriage is concerned. The number of young men who marry before this period—before their twenty-fourth year—is comparatively small. In spite of this, the relatively late appearance of full sexual maturity should counsel prudence to those who believe early marriage to be the solution of the "sexual problem of the young man."

Further, the fact that the duration of sexual maturity is different in both sexes should cause no difficulties. Even

although the capacity for propagation ceases far earlier in the woman than in the man, no serious trouble should arise because, as the woman approaches the menopause, there is usually no longer any desire for pregnancy. Further, the desire for sexual connection and willingness to perform the sexual act, may continue to exist in a woman who has regularly practised sexual connection, and still continues to practise it long after the cessation of her ovarian activities. Therefore, marriage harmony is not threatened from this aspect, especially if the man, as is usually the case, is a few years older than the woman.

Generally speaking, if the husband and wife are about the same age, the prospects of happiness in this respect are by no means bad. But, if there is a great disparity in the ages, the man being considerably younger than the woman, this physiological difference, together with all the factors associated with it, may seriously, if not inevitably, endanger the harmony of the marriage.

Often, the difference between the man's potency and the sexual capacity of his wife is of far greater importance as far as their happiness is concerned. The woman who has not to produce any substance like the sperma in coitus, a process which makes great claims on the physical strength of the man, can, just because of this, reach orgasm during a certain period far more frequently than the man, so that it may be said that her sexual power, provided that the attraction is sufficiently strong, is much greater than his. If this great potency is found together with an equally strong desire for sexual connection, the man may have claims made upon him, in this respect, that he cannot fulfil uninterruptedly without injury to his health, and particularly to his mental capabilities. It is clear that this difference in sexual potency may lead to separation, either by direct or indirect means.

Such a relatively (as compared with the husband) exaggerated desire for sexual connection is not, in fact, so very frequently encountered, although it is less rare than is generally believed.

On the other hand, if the opposite is the case, it is often found to be the beginning of hostility in marriage. It must indeed be considered probable that inequalities in this respect, resulting in feelings of disappointment, both in the husband and wife, are the usual cause of estrangement. Such disappointment may either be a general vague feeling or consciously experienced.

We know that in normal, that is to say, not pathological, conditions there is no question of the woman being unable to perform coitus, or more correctly, to permit copulation, for the capacity for this, apart from certain exceptions, invariably exists.

Nevertheless, we are also aware of the fact that a woman, who only tolerates sexual connection without real pleasure, herself sooner or later feels a more or less strong aversion to it. It is common knowledge that such coitus only satisfies the man's desire to a very relative extent ; in other words, his usual feeling is one of disappointment—a disappointment that may be so strong in a sensitive man that his feelings may undergo a sudden and complete transformation, and turn to hatred. Even if this hatred dies out almost at once, the feelings of displeasure evoked by such coitus linger in the minds of the husband and wife. This brings about a mental condition at first temporary, but becoming later (as the result of the continued repetition of the mental trauma associated with connection) permanent and more definite, of resentment or rancour, which is one of the origins of chronic erotic antipathy.

The inequality referred to, which is often, indeed, according to many authors, very frequently encountered, is generally ascribed to feminine frigidity (that is to say, deficient sexual capacity or sex coldness).

Men writing on feminine problems are blamed by feminists for judging women wrongly, in that they take the man as the only authoritative standard of criticism instead of employing a different standard for each sex. Such protests are often justifiable, but hardly ever has a real injustice been obscured by so much biassed and exaggerated propaganda.

The frigidity of the woman is, and has been, not only described as a common condition, but is also considered as a symptom of inferiority, as a more or less morbid state.

There is no doubt that such a condition may be pathological. Books, many books, some of which are worthless trash, while others are of genuine importance, have been written on the subject.¹ Naturally, they cannot all be mentioned here, and it is quite impossible to examine the problem in detail. We shall confine ourselves, therefore, to certain points of particular importance for our purpose. As such, I mention first of all the manifestation of sexual deficiency in feeling as a neurotic symptom, caused by the repression of emotions of an entirely different nature, as we have seen from the foregoing chapter. Particular emphasis should be laid on the fact that a justified or unjustified feeling of guilt is usually found in association with this, because (as *H. Hofstätter* has observed on p. 585 of "The Handbook of Sexual Science"), in such cases, an unconscious "I will not" is usually concealed behind "I cannot."

In particular, such an effect may be produced if there exists in the mind of the person in question the fear of discovery, associated with the feeling of guilt caused by masturbation, or resulting from a homosexual tendency. Also, the woman who practises masturbation is often in conflict with herself, and this makes her unsuitable for marriage. Thus, it is quite wrong to advise such a girl, as is, unfortunately, only too often the case, to marry before she has conquered the bad habit, and is in harmony with herself. Even if she has not the strength to do this alone, a successful cure will almost always be effected if she calls in a doctor who has had a psychotherapeutic training. Naturally, a thorough physical examination must precede the mental treatment.²

¹ I can only mention *Otto Adler's* book, "Defective Sexual Feeling in Women," 3rd edition (Fischer, Berlin, 1919); *W. Stekel's* book, "Sexual Frigidity in Women" (Urban and Schwarzenberg, Vienna, 1927); and *K. Friedländer's* "Impotence in Women" (E. Bircher, Leipzig, 1921, with detailed bibliography).

² *Alice M. Hutchinson* has written an interesting article on this subject, "Masturbation in Young Girls," *The Lancet*, 26th December, 1925.

An attempt to combat a homosexual tendency by marriage is an experiment fraught with much more serious difficulty, particularly if this tendency has led to relationships which have gone beyond the platonic. Homosexual tendencies, associated with inhibitions towards the opposite sex, are mental factors of such significance that a woman thus constituted is, owing to her addiction to abnormal stimuli, incapable of reaching orgasm with a man. The failure of such attempts strengthens both the inhibition and the unnatural tendencies. The vicious circle is complete and the collapse of the marriage is inevitable. *Bourdet* has portrayed such a case on the stage in his play: "The Captive." Although this play would have been still more convincing if the impression received had been that the man, who made this unreasonable and hardly elevating attempt, had really put his whole soul into the achievement of success, it can, nevertheless, serve as a warning to such "prisoners" not to lay themselves and others open to rash experiments of this kind.

Cases in which the woman's sexual indifference towards the man is due, to a certain degree, to latent homosexuality, are more frequently encountered. As, however, these women's sexual impulse is usually only slightly developed, and, moreover, is not completely inverted, but bi-sexual, the husband can help his wife to conquer the abnormality, if he understands how to guide her thoughts, and how, with skilful technique, to develop her sexual desires along normal lines. Very often the "aberration" passes unnoticed by him, and she is unconscious of it. The man in question, however, must know what should be done and must be ready to take the trouble to put his knowledge into practice. If, in spite of this, he finds the task beyond his powers, he should summon a competent physician, and there is no reason why the treatment prescribed by him should not be completely successful.

What we have said here about certain mental causes of more or less pathological frigidity in the woman towards the man is equally true, apart from certain obvious differ-

ences, of deficiency of sexual feeling in the man towards the woman. This is particularly true if the man has homosexual tendencies.

A man cannot be too strongly warned against making an attempt to combat a homosexual tendency by marriage, and it is equally reprehensible to marry if any other form of sexual perversion exists.

Latent homosexuality in the man is much more serious than in the woman, especially if this is associated with feeble normal instincts, or if, for other reasons, these instincts are distinctly below the average. The main reason for this is that sexual deficiency of feeling in the man is less easily overcome by technical physiological treatment than in the case of the woman, because, at any rate at the beginning, the initiative lies with the man. Further, the moment this deficiency in feeling becomes definitely pronounced, it is associated with such disturbances of the functions essential to the normal carrying out of coitus, for example, if there is complete failure to achieve erection, that the act is made difficult or impossible.

I cannot attempt to deal in detail here with the seriousness of impotence in the man, particularly in its common and relatively mild forms, as far as marriage is concerned. The whole problem is too extensive and complex. I have not even the space to mention other causes of sexual incapacity, for they are far too numerous.

It is a difficult matter even to classify these disturbances correctly, for a classification that would meet with scientific requirements, would have disadvantages in practice, because it would associate certain things not allied to each other in practice, and dissociate others that should be co-ordinated.¹ Practically speaking, a more useful classification would be one in which purely sexual impotence was opposed to disturbances in the sexual capacity associated with normal sexual organs.

This second group can be further subdivided, including

¹ This is true, for example, of *Hirschfeld's* schedule which differentiates between a cerebral, a spinal and a genital form of impotence, thus distinguishing between deficient sexual impulse, defective or inadequate erection and ejaculation capabilities and mechanical disturbances.

in one section, functional nervous and mental disturbances affecting potency, and, in the other, the decrease in sexual power resulting from disease in general. In such a classification, impotence caused by inverted tendencies forms a separate group.

I do not wish to ignore this matter altogether because, at any rate, it gives some sort of insight into the numerous causes of impotence (for example, sexual frigidity in the man)

As I have already remarked, we cannot consider this subject at present, and it is sufficient to our purpose to point out that deficient sexual potency in the man (particularly in its common form of irritable weakness, in which ejaculation takes place much too rapidly) is far more often the starting point of hostility in marriage than is generally recognised.

The sexual impulse, both in the man and in the woman, is dependent to a great measure on the influence of the hormones (particularly on the effect of the internal secretion of the sex glands), and infantilism is of great importance as far as deficiency in potency is concerned. I now conclude my comments on deficiency in potency, which, of necessity, have been far too short, with the final observation that in regard to pathological frigidity, such disturbances occur perhaps even more often in the man than in the woman.

The facts are quite different—and here we return to the starting point of our previous considerations—in cases of what may be termed physiological frigidity. The reason for this is that the woman's sexual education is gradual. After a certain time, she begins to experience feelings of desire of so intense a nature that she takes as much pleasure as her husband in sexual connection, and wishes for the repetition of the act. Another reason for physiological frigidity in the inexperienced woman is that the desired stimulus in coitus takes a much longer time to produce than is the case with the man. Thus, if her husband does not take this fact into account, she does not reach orgasm because he has already reacted long before she is ready.

It is quite clear that this results in a feeling of dissatisfaction which, if it is continually repeated, becomes chronic, unless the man and woman have succeeded in adapting themselves to each other relatively quickly, or that the man has learned how to satisfy the now obvious requirements of his wife. This discordance leads not only to disturbances of the sexual organs, owing to the fact that the stimulus is produced again and again without any natural reaction, (which has an equally harmful effect on the mind) but has a directly injurious influence on the woman's mental condition. At the same time, she feels, consciously or unconsciously, humiliated, owing to the fact that coitus brings her nothing but disappointments and displeasure, although she must tolerate it again and again. Indeed, she comes to consider that she is only being used as an instrument of lust by the man.

The further development of the situation may be guessed from what we have said previously. Further, it has been, to a large extent, summarised in Chapter I.

Moreover, such hostility is mutual, because the man considers the woman's physiological frigidity to be an abnormality, a defect. - Wrongly, however, as I have already said, or at least, wrongly as far as the main factors are concerned. For the man judges such frigidity from his point of view alone. This is incorrect, because both the man and the woman, as far as sexual union (the act of propagation) is concerned, are equals, for they must each, following nature's laws, participate fully in the act. The woman is equally justified in claiming as a "norm" her sexual reaction in coitus because the fact that she, too, reaches orgasm must be regarded as favourable to fertilisation. Considered from this point of view, the woman might accuse the man of inferiority because his physiological *ejaculatio præcox*, his too rapid ejaculation, proved impotence to some extent—an impotence that could also be proved by the experienced woman judging by her own standard of sexual capacity, which is definitely greater.

It must, however, be made quite clear that, in this connection, it is entirely incorrect to speak of masculine

inadequacy. I believe it to be equally wrong to regard feminine frigidity, at the outset of marriage, as an inferiority. And, in quoting the example of the change of the standard of judgment, I intended merely to show the fallacy of this attitude, which may be most injurious to married harmony.

Between man and woman there exists, in this respect, the definite difference between the types of energy we have already observed in the reproductive cell, which we shall encounter again. The feminine cell can only become active and develop by means of the masculine cell. This is also typically true of sexual feelings. Inadequacy of the woman can only be spoken of (in the sense of a defect—and judged by a feminine standard) if she retains her initial (relative) lack of feeling after she has had sufficient opportunity to develop her sexual desires and capacities. On the other hand, judged from the above standpoint, the husband must be considered "inadequate" if he shows himself incapable or unwilling to give his wife, by adapting himself to her needs, sufficient opportunity to develop her sexual feelings and capacities.

"Just as the woman becomes fully matured through the man, so the man must prove that he *is* a man to the woman." ¹

Apart from the differences that exist between man and woman in their sexual capacities and feelings, there are feelings that are based on the importance for both sexes of impregnation and its results.

Actually, the sexual union is far more important in the life of the woman than in that of the man.

This starts from the first coitus, which, from the mental aspect, has only an episodic importance for the man, and, physically is, as a matter of fact, quite insignificant, while, for the woman, it is an event that makes an indelible impression upon her both physically and mentally.

Much might be written regarding the importance, as far

¹ Stated by *Hans von Hattingberg* with regard to the relationship between man and woman, in general, but particularly appropriate here.

as the mind is concerned, of the transition stage when the girl is becoming a woman. We shall not, however, examine the matter here, as it is of no great importance for the purpose of this book. I only desire to call attention to the fact that the mental transition does not occur suddenly like the physical transition, but only gradually. The husband, therefore, must take this fact into account, if he does not wish to run the risk of wounding his wife's feelings.

We have said what is essential in my book, "Ideal Marriage," and in the second chapter of this book regarding the mental significance of defloration, and the fact that it may cause a trauma if the first coitus is accompanied by more than the usual difficulties.

We may add and recall to mind that normal defloration, too, on account of the elements of subordination, injury, pain and disappointment involved, arouses a certain (of course, mostly unconscious) feeling of hostility towards the man who performs the act. On the contrary, however, and in spite of this, it by no means seldom evokes a deep feeling in the woman that the man who had deflowered her has made her happy, and this binds her for ever to this man, even though he has been only a passing episode in her life.

And, finally, we must emphasize the fact that it depends on the character of the woman, and particularly on the behaviour of the man during and in the short time after the initial coitus—from his tenderness, from the value that he attaches to her surrender—if the above-mentioned positive or negative feelings gain the upper hand. If the man behaves tactlessly or roughly in this moment—so significant in the life of the woman—such hostile feelings may arise in her that, whether there is to be unconquerable sexual opposition or not, is decided at the time of defloration, this may appear in the general form of pathological frigidity, but also as irrevocable hostility in marriage.

It is superfluous again to compare the important changes that woman goes through indirectly when she begins her active sexual life, particularly under the influence of the hormones, with the far less important changes that occur in the man. We have said what is essential in the first volume

and, furthermore, it is of very little importance as a cause of antagonism in marriage.

Far more important, on the contrary, are the direct results of normal sexual connection: the absorption of seminal materials and (possible) impregnation with all its consequences. I have spoken about this in such detail already that it is unnecessary to deal with the matter again. Nevertheless, I wish to emphasize that both the recurrence of an undesired, and the failure of a desired, pregnancy relatively often cause marriage difficulties, or aggravate an already existing estrangement. Such feelings may originate either in the man or the woman, or they may be shared by both simultaneously. However unpleasant it may be to have to admit it, husband and wife very often reproach each other in regard to this, and sometimes violent quarrels ensue.

Owing to the seminal absorption, the woman's whole body is penetrated by the masculine materials, while, as far as the man is concerned, no such process occurs. In every union that takes its natural course, the woman experiences a sensation that may be compared, in many ways, to the effect on the body of the injection of a small quantity of serum. The duration of this effect cannot be estimated, but we know that it cannot be short. Are its after-effects so powerful that it is capable of influencing a child born subsequently through coitus with another man? I can come to no definite opinion on this point. Those who are interested in the problem may refer to the highly interesting investigations made by the Dutch scientist *Kohlbrugge* and published in his book "The Influence of the Spermatozoa on the Uterus: A Contribution to Telephony" in the *Morphological and Anthropological Review*, Vol. XII. Both men and women would benefit greatly by the reading of this monograph.

Nevertheless, it is beyond all doubt that the feminine organism is saturated with the masculine materials transmitted during coitus. It is equally undeniable that this saturation may be of significance for the woman. It will be readily understood that this fact is of great importance for the woman and man who possess reasonably developed psycho-erotic feelings.

If pregnancy results from the union, then, by reason of the close association between mother and foetus, and the continuous interchange of materials between the mother and the embryonic organism, the woman is impregnated with substances to a far greater extent, which come from the foetus, that is to say, originating partly from the man who has impregnated her—a process that leaves traces behind it for a considerable period.

For this very reason, the results of impregnation, even if it does not lead to the birth of a child (owing to miscarriage), are highly important. When, in addition to this, we recall the very significant changes in other directions that take place owing to pregnancy in the body of the woman, then we do not even need to think of delivery, child-bed, period of lactation and the child itself, in order to understand the importance of the sexual act for the woman.

The difference in the importance of coitus for the man and for the woman is rooted in the very basis of things. Its natural results are so entirely disparate in the two sexes that only unbounded ignorance and superficiality or short-sighted pedantry could attribute "double sexual morality" to the so-called domination of the woman by the man. That there have been peoples, and still are peoples, who, living under the domination of woman, believe in a "double morality" in the opposite sense and contrary to the laws of nature, cannot alter the fact that nature gives man the greatest possible sexual freedom, while the woman has to bear the results of her sexual act for a relatively long time, in some cases, indeed, throughout her whole life.

The magnitude of the possible consequences of an act determine the magnitude of the responsibility which falls on the man carrying out the action. The biological facts are that the consequences of natural coitus are of far greater significance for the woman than for the man. Thus, her responsibility towards herself in this respect is far greater, and the rules she must make for herself, in these matters, must be far more rigid than the duties entailed by sexual questions on the man.

A very important psychological element also enters in here, which is recognized as such by those women who, like *Else Voigtländer*, are of the opinion that "the dogma of the monogamous nature of the woman and the polygamous nature of the man must, generally, be regarded only as a theoretical residue of moral claims or of the demands for possession made by the dominant sex." Even if the woman desires to perform the sexual act with more than one person, such a tendency is usually suppressed, because the feminine mind is naturally influenced by the primitive symbolism of possession and surrender. Surrender entails closer association with the real personality, and is in the nature of a gift which the woman who feels deeply only wishes to make once and then wholly, while, on the other hand, *repetition involves a certain degradation*. All this points to the fact that "free living" women are considered less worthy. Changes, as far as the man is concerned, have no influence on his personality, but, indeed, may be valuable experience and enhance his worth.¹ The binding nature of the marriage tie determines the sexual attitude, and thus, what we have said holds to a still greater degree. It is equally obvious that a married woman's connection with another, which endangers the husband, children and family, owing to the penetration of a foreign element, is much more significant than sexual unfaithfulness on the part of the man; by stating this, I do not mean that such an action can be defended.

We shall have more to say in the next chapter about married fidelity, when we discuss the prevention of hostility in marriage. But, what we have said will suffice for the moment. For, it is quite clear that there are absolute differences between the man and the woman in sexual union, which may and are indeed bound to lead to sexual or married antagonism, if the husband and wife fail to take these differences into account and thus bridge over the gulf.

¹ *Marcuses' Dictionary, etc.*, p. 246.

CHAPTER VIII

FROM SPECIFIC AVERSION TO ANTAGONISM IN MARRIAGE

IF we think over the contents of the previous chapter again, we are forced to conclude that, in the relationship of the sexes, in addition to and parallel with the power that attracts the masculine and feminine to each other, repelling forces are also at work. These attracting and repelling forces, run parallel to each other, and are often so closely associated, and frequently vacillate so irregularly to one side or the other, that the individual who is subjected to their effect is not aware which of them dominates at any given moment.

This is particularly true of the primary sexual forces and of the erotic feelings arising from them, which we have observed in "Ideal Marriage" to be the attractive, positive, constructive feelings, and which, in Chapters II. and III., we have considered in their repellent, negative and destructive aspect, as far as the scope and purpose of this book permits—that is to say, without examining really morbid mental or physical disturbances. It is, of course, true that such deviations of a specifically sexual or general nature may be of far greater importance, for the relationships between man and woman (as indeed they usually are) than the more or less normal factors we have discussed. Particularly if mental disturbances are present, existing or latent antagonism in people who are bound to each other may develop into a hatred rivalling, in its intensity and outward action, the most terrible of human passions.

Apart from the purely sexual, that is to say, directly connected with the sexual functions and emotions—qualities of man and woman which we have considered not only in

themselves but also, at the same time, in their reciprocal effect, our interest was arrested by what might be called the indirectly sexual, because, although they are dominated by sex, they do not come under the heading of direct sexual action, in the narrower sense of the word (Chapters III.-VI.).

We have confined ourselves to the broad outlines of masculine and feminine peculiarities, for it would be valueless and absurd, indeed absolutely impossible, to examine all the mental qualities possessed by human beings—*Heymans* and *Wiersma* mention in their questionnaire no less than ninety—to discover if they are to be considered as masculine, feminine or neutral. Those who desire to study the details of these problems, will find a mass of material which has been edited by these authors in "Contributions to Specialised Psychology based on the Answers to a Questionnaire," in which, to quote an example, emotional capacity and its associated qualities, and the primary and secondary cerebral functions are placed together.

What has been said about the main masculine and feminine qualities may also be applied to various individual characters. It may, in certain circumstances, be applied to human beings, various classes of society, of greater or less culture, of small or great talents. Further, it permits us to consider masculine and feminine from the same aspect, instead of proceeding, by way of comparison, which is both basically wrong and unsound—that is to say, to accept one of the two sexes as normal and to judge the others by this standard.

The chief point is, however, that, if we had gone into detail, we would have lost the broad prospective, and would have run the risk of not seeing the wood for the trees. What we have learned from our investigations, in regard to the basic characteristics of man and woman, is quite sufficient to enable us to judge how great is the gulf separating the one sex from the other.

Masculine thought and feeling and feminine thought and feeling circle round opposite poles. Masculine being and feminine being, masculine energy and feminine energy are polar and are, to a great extent indeed, opposite poles.

Masculine striving and feminine striving proceed in quite different directions.

The masculine being is ego-centric and strives towards the opposite, while the feminine circles round the subjective and merges into the ego.

After all that has been said in Chapters III. to VI. and after what has been said above, do we require further proof of the fact that two people who are so absolutely differently constituted can never understand each other completely and must often misunderstand each other; and that the one will often judge wrongly the motives and actions of the other, at least from another point of view and from another attitude of mind?

As a result of all this, is there not abundant material for conflict where two so different people live together in such close association?

Nevertheless, under certain conditions, this contrast may not be so acute.

No man is absolutely and entirely masculine, no woman exclusively feminine; and this is true both of the physical characteristics and of the mental qualities. Everywhere in nature, among plants and animals, in addition to sexual differentiation, bi-sexual traits may be seen. This is shown not only by investigation of the embryo, but is also observed in adults where rudiments of the other sex are, more or less, clearly to be recognized. More evident, however, than the existing signs of bi-sexuality—many of which are so concealed that they can only be demonstrated by the anatomist, while others are so familiar (for example, the nipples of the male) that they have ceased to attract attention—are the changes sometimes noticed in the sexual characteristics of adult, sexually differentiated individuals. We see examples of this both in animal and plant life. Thus, the "ragged robin," as the result of the effect of parasitic fungi, and the maize plant, owing to sudden transplantation, may change their sex. Of more significance for our purpose, however, are the cases cited by *A. Koelsch*, in which age produces that change observed in the "mercury" (mer-

curialis perennis) and in certain species of butterflies. Such cases have a certain similarity with what has often been noticed in human beings, the importance of which is not apparent because we are so accustomed to the phenomenon; that old women become more masculine and (although this is much less marked) feminine characteristics are observed in old men.

Numerous and highly significant cases demonstrate the bi-sexual constitution of the higher animals. Experiments have shown that, by total or partial removal of the sex glands of laboratory animals (guinea-pigs and hens are usually employed) and the grafting of sex gland tissue of an animal of the same species but of the opposite sex, a very far-reaching reversal in the sexual characteristics is obtained. The names of *Knud Sand* (Denmark), *Steinach* (Austria), and *Pezard* (France) are mainly connected with these extremely important experiments. Such experiments are by no means so easy as they appear superficially. For, if the experiment is to be successful, every possible preliminary condition must be fulfilled. All we require to know for our present purposes is that these experiments have proved that the predisposition of an individual of one sex to develop the physical characteristics and mental qualities of the opposite sex (so that a "masculinized" female behaves like a male and *vice versa*) is present in such a high degree that it is very considerably developed as a result of the influence of the transformation of the sex glands, while the qualities of the original sex atrophy and relapse.

Naturally, such experiments have not been performed on human beings. Sex glands have indeed been grafted on human beings for therapeutic purposes; but the object of this has been always to strengthen the existing characteristics and functions of the person in question (the dominating sex), and not in any way to suppress these characteristics or bring about the domination of the other sex.

Sometimes certain isolated cases are encountered in which nature herself makes an experiment, which goes further than the laboratory experiments of research workers. *Sellheim* gave a lecture with slides on such a case at the

meeting of the "German Society for Gynæcology," at Vienna in 1925. The following is a quotation from the report of the Congress :

" I shall now demonstrate to you by means of a number of lantern slides, a case of ' masculinisation ' and feminine reconversion. The first slide shows a completely feminine individual, aged 36. She has borne several children. At the age of 43, a distinct ' masculinisation ' occurred ; strong growth of beard (naturally kept shaved), short curly hair, masculinisation of the facial features and masculine growth of hair over the whole body. Angular, squarely built figure, with, on the whole, a more masculine distribution of the muscles and adipose tissue. Stronger pigmentation of the skin, deep bass voice with elongation of the vocal chords and protuberance of the Adam's apple ; very marked penis-like enlargement of the clitoris, antipathy towards the man (second slide). A third picture, in which the breasts, the principal feminine attribute that strikes the eye, cannot be seen, and shows the masculine line of the head even more clearly. The woman felt deeply depressed on account of her condition. Children often ran after her in the streets, calling out ' Witch.' - Some centuries ago, she would have run the risk of being burned as a witch, owing to this ' masculinisation.' "

Sellheim removed a large myoma from the wall of the womb, and a small tumour from the left ovary (which had ceased to function) of the woman, and grafted on them two discs of ovarian tissue taken from another woman. A myoma is a commonly occurring tumour, of a non-malignant nature, formed from muscle and connective tissue, which probably had no connection with the appearance of masculinity.

" After this, as the following pictures, taken a year and a half after the operation, show, complete reversion to the feminine constitution, with disappearance of the characteristics demonstrated, occurred. If the last picture is compared with that taken in the thirty-sixth year, it is clearly recognisable how closely the woman resembles what she was previously, after the disappearance of the masculine

traits. The growth of the tumour in the ovary was the cause of the masculinity. It was first thought that testicular tissue had penetrated the ovary, or had developed there, and that the tissue had won the upper hand over the ovary at the approaching menopause which was becoming inactive."

Unfortunately, a microscopic examination of the small tumour, which had been removed, was not successful in determining the exact nature of the tissue. The material was submitted to a great number of scientists, but they could come to no definite opinion. In spite of this, the case is extremely interesting, because a change of sex took place twice, quite obviously caused by radical alterations in the nature of the inner secretion of the sex glands. (This lecture, with the photographs of the woman in the various stages, appear in Part 5, Volume XII. of the *Archives for Gynecology and Constitutional Research*.)

All this proves, and therefore I have dealt with it somewhat at length, that an absolutely masculine man and a wholly feminine woman do not exist. There is only a plus or a minus in masculinity and femininity. Not only physically but also, and in particular, mentally.

This has been repeatedly observed in the course of the centuries, and philosophers and writers have also referred to it. Indeed, in recent times, the quantum of masculinity and femininity present in the character, in the mental and moral qualities of man and woman, have been calculated and described in mathematical formulæ. But this, in my opinion, only leads to an apparently exact estimation of relationships that *cannot* be described in any way accurately. I believe, therefore, such formulæ to be undesirable. Apart from this, they are quite superfluous because the idea of mental bi-sexuality is as apparent as any such idea can be. There are no mental qualities that are the exclusive property of man. In this respect, one cannot even speak of any specifically masculine quality. The *mother instinct* alone is specifically feminine; but even this is not exclusively feminine.

Thus, mentally, there is in every man and every woman

only a plus or minus of masculinity or femininity. Man is woman too in his soul, and woman, man. The result of this is that the difference existing between man and woman in character, in personality, in thinking, feeling, living, in action and reaction, is, to some extent, mitigated, since some mutual understanding is thereby made possible.

A further result is that the relationship between the sexes is actually and frequently complicated in the most extraordinary way. For the man, at least the normal man who is not decadent—apart from exceptions which are to be found, for example, among artists—wishes to be a man, to feel himself a man and to act, whenever possible, as a man. He does not allow the feeling arising from the feminine characteristics in him to reach his consciousness. He suppresses them or sublimates them. Furthermore, he desires the woman to be feminine, specifically feminine, and, indeed, exclusively feminine, even if he pretends to admire, to appreciate or to think clever certain masculine or so-called masculine qualities in her.

And the woman? Is there *really* one, even among the fanatical men-women who (unless there is a homosexual disposition, or disturbance of the inner secretion) if honest, will not admit that she would like to be feminine, specifically feminine and exclusively feminine (or at one time wished to be) and would have been only too glad to have seen a "real" man enter her life?

Thus, man and woman *are* and *remain*, in spite of their bi-sexual constitution, strangers in their inmost souls to each other; because the one wishes to be masculine and must instinctively remain masculine, and the other feminine: because neither of them desire to feel and think in the same way, and cannot think and feel in the same way; because, in them, conclusion and inference follow different paths; because the one does not even have a glimmering of the standpoint on which the desires, feeling, thought and inference of the other is based. The only exceptions are those few who have insight, and, at the same time, possess the self-control to allow this insight to dominate when it is most necessary.

The totally opposite points of view of man and woman, which are seen both in the directly sexual feelings and in those that are indirectly sexual, and thus in the whole mental life, generally lead to a certain antagonism between the masculine and feminine portions of society. Those who have an average capacity for observation, have ears to hear and eyes to see with, who, first and foremost, read what thinking men and women have written about the subject, are bound to meet with this hostility again and again, unless they are entirely dominated by the sexual impulse, or obsessed by another emotional complex that prevents such understanding. It is perfectly true that the sexual impulse is so powerful, that the desire for connection is so obviously paramount at all times and in all places, that this impulse is the mainspring of the relations between the sexes.

But sexual attraction, however clearly it may show itself in society, only conceals the antagonism between the sexes to the superficial onlooker, and the specific aversion separating man and woman from each other, inevitably comes to the forefront however much one may try to deny it.

In marriage, in which two people live together on a sexual basis, and are in continuous and close mental contact with each other, all the factors that may cause both sexual attraction and repulsion are present in a high degree.

At first, the attraction is usually of such a nature that the feelings of repulsion have no opportunity of making themselves felt, but are entirely suppressed.

The stronger mutual sexual attraction is, the longer this state of affairs will continue. This is not determined by the original "tempo" of the marriage. Indeed, to a certain extent, the opposite is quite often the case. It depends on the sexual attraction remaining strong enough to predominate continuously.

The more certain the man and the woman are that they can always give each other the desired sexual satisfaction, the nearer the happiness of love which they find in their sexual relationships approaches perfection, the greater is the possibility that sexual attraction will remain dominant.

But experience teaches us that the prospects of this are by no means great in most marriages. We are well aware that, in many marriages, sexual approach does not receive its due even at the beginning, since there is no question of the receiving and giving of complete satisfaction.

Therefore, we should not be surprised if, sooner or later, the attraction becomes weak, and is no longer capable permanently to suppress the antagonism. This antagonism soon makes itself felt. At first, it shows itself only in a mild form and comes to the forefront in special circumstances. There are long periods when it does not appear at all, and is not yet distinctly recognizable. Gradually, it becomes bolder, appears more frequently, and shows itself in its true colours. Thus, a position is reached in which, at one moment, the attraction, and then the repulsion is the stronger, a position which, if the attraction decreases and hostility increases, leads to a state of affairs which is by no means rare in marriage, and which dishonours the husband and wife and love itself. In these circumstances, aversion dominates permanently, and the impulse to connection takes a second place, becoming merely a means for the relaxation of purely physical tension. From time to time, this may dominate the situation for a short period.

In such cases, the sexual attraction that existed between the married pair yields to antagonism, because slowly and surely, it becomes weaker.

The process of the defeat of married attraction proceeds more actively in those cases in which the definite sexual incapacity of one of the partners increases the antagonism of the other, and turns it into sexual aversion, indeed into hatred—a feeling which, like all feelings of this nature, very soon finds its echo. Such cases have been dealt with in detail in the preceding chapter. *Relative* insufficiency on the part of the man can have similar effects, although less acute, if, in the first period of the marriage, which should be devoted to the erotic education of the woman, he fails to take into account the initial slowness of her sexual reactions, owing either to ignorance, indifference or egotism.

To a great extent, also of a purely sexual nature, but more closely associated with marriage than the previous reasons, are those causes of discord between man and woman which are the result of a difference in their wishes regarding the consequences of sexual connection. Even if these wishes are the same, if they are not fulfilled, antagonism may follow. This antagonism, however, is no longer purely sexual, but is more conjugal in its nature. Naturally, I refer here to such cases in which a barren marriage is the cause of separation. It must be added that one of the married pair, often quite wrongly, lays the blame on the other. Usually, the man believes the sterility of the marriage to be due to his wife—by no means always rightly—because gonorrhœa, contracted by him, is often the direct cause, or the sterility is accounted for by infection previously transmitted by him to his wife.

Still more often, far more often than because of sterility, separation is due, as we have explained previously, to the coming of children, particularly if one of the partners has no particular objection to pregnancy or indeed desires it, while the other only contemplates such a possibility with horror.

Infidelity must be mentioned as a further cause of married hostility. It is, however, only very rarely that this is the sole ground for estrangement. In a harmonious marriage, harmonious also from the sexual point of view, the woman is only rarely inclined to be unfaithful, and, further, fights such an inclination with all her power and almost always successfully. The man may, perhaps, run more risk of being dominated by sexual feelings for another woman, or wish to satisfy his will to power by overcoming her resistance. He will also more easily yield to such latent tendencies, but this will not cause hostility in a marriage which is otherwise harmonious. Certainly not in the man, because both the sexual and the other ties that bind him to his wife are by far the most powerful. Nor in the woman, because, in an otherwise happy marriage, her love is so great and her attachment so strong, that she forgives. This, if it

is done with tact and graciousness, strengthens the marriage bond to a marked degree.

It is quite a different matter when disharmony has already existed between the married pair, particularly if they disagree regarding the fulfilment of their sexual desires.

Not only is it then highly probable that they will be impelled by the desire for more complete satisfaction to find a way out with someone else ; but there is also considerable danger that the new alliance will prove itself to be stronger than the old one, at least for the time being. It is quite easy to understand that the unfaithful partner comes to feel an aversion to the marriage, involving as it does restriction of his freedom, and as a result his hostility against the person who is the cause of this restriction increases. This is a fairly simple process in so far as processes which agitate the mind so violently can be simple.

On the other hand, the factors causing married hostility in the innocent person, are of a very varied nature. Injured love, if this still exists, but still more injured vanity ; resentment at being scorned, rancour, because of the insult suffered, greatly increased if it is more or less patent ; shattered consciousness of power ; the feeling of having been unfairly deprived of an acknowledged right (of a moral, social, legal right) ; anxiety about material things ; indignation at the betrayal generally associated here with infidelity ; jealousy because of the sexual satisfaction or the happiness in love that one or the other is presumed to have found—these are the most important factors. Usually, such feelings lead to reproaches, to bitter reproaches, and very often indeed to scenes. Such happenings drive the guilty party still more towards the other person in the triangle, and increase the aversion and antagonism of both partners towards each other. Finally, the devil comes to the footlights, as at the end of *Molnar's* play, and says : " Here's a pretty piece of work."

Among these factors, we have mentioned three that are the most important elements of jealousy—injured love, envy of

what the other has obtained, while he or she is deprived of this, and the threat to autocratic domination.

The first two factors, although fundamentally different in their forms, are, nevertheless, closely connected with each other in married jealousy, and are seen in the following mental complex—sexual and non-sexual jealousy. The third factor is of particular significance in cases where this complex has assumed a neurotic character.

“Jealousy is a passion desirous of creating suffering.” This is a well-known, but none the less characteristic aphorism. It demonstrates in fact two typical symptoms of neurosis. It causes suffering and diminishes capacity for life and work. Its aim cannot be doubted—sole domination over another. The means to this end may be of an aggressive, tyrannical character, or may be of an indirect nature. In this latter case, jealousy appears in the guise of patient martyrdom. It is repeatedly asseverated that there is no question of jealousy.

This last mentioned method of attaining and maintaining the married dominance is usually employed by women. It has the great advantage of calling forth a stronger sense of guilt in the man, particularly if he is not entirely “innocent,” because he “abuses the freedom” that his wife allows him (which is, in fact, only an illusory freedom). By being able to increase this feeling of guilt, the woman succeeds in “subjugating” the man. *Alice Bühl-Gerstel*¹ sees in such attempts on the part of the woman to assure to herself the exclusive possession of the man, a struggle for security, and thus, she considers jealousy as an expression of a specifically feminine desire to guarantee herself in such possession, a secure support in life. Without agreeing with all the opinions of the authoress, it must be recognized that, this purely scientific investigation, entirely free from bias, written by a woman on feminine jealousy, is worthy of the close attention both of women and men.

It is sufficiently well known that very often jealousy does not confine itself to a real or supposed rival, but includes all

¹ *International Review for Individual Psychology*, Third year, Vol. 6.

other people and things that attract the devotion or interest of the man. The man who marries a jealous woman is forced to listen to continual reproaches, not only because of his relationships with his parents and his friends, but even because of his love for his children who are also her children. Indeed, her jealous thoughts return to his past life and speculate on the future. Both those with whom he associates and his interests suffer from this ; his hobbies, his dog, his horse, his aviary, his factory or his office, his books and his work. Above all, his books and his work, because the woman sees in them her most powerful rival.

It would not be correct to say that such jealousy does not occur in men. But it is rare, at any rate much rarer than in women. In *Alice Bühl-Gerstel's* statements, we find an illuminating explanation of this fact.

The unhealthy nature of the phenomena we have described is clear. In less obvious cases, this is not so easily recognized, but it cannot be doubted by the expert that even then such jealousy is neurotic.

I think I should emphasize once again that repression plays a very important part in the origin of neurotic disturbances. We have repeatedly drawn attention in previous chapters to such repression with particular reference to the importance of an unsatisfactory sexual life. It is quite clear that this factor may be of special significance in the origin of morbid jealousy. It is, therefore, all the more essential to bear in mind the repression of other impulses, feelings and desires, for example, the mother instinct. This repression is, in many cases, the inevitable result of the attitude to life, and the mode of life of many modern women (and of very many men also).

The neurotic passion here referred to creates suffering not only for the woman, its victim, but for the man who also suffers as a result of it, and it is one of the most certain means of bringing about hostility in marriage.

As we have now crossed the borders of psycho-pathology, we can properly deal with *hysteria*, or better, with a hysterical mental outlook, as the cause of antagonism in marriage.

For it will scarcely be contradicted that the phenomena encountered in the form of jealousy, such as has been described above, can be termed "hysterical symptoms."

Hysterical symptoms are symbols of something repressed. They are characterized by close association with a definite tendency appearing clearly in the foreground. This tendency is based on exaggerated "self-security at all costs," on the desire to avoid the unpleasant by all possible means and to ward off harmful influences. Such an end may be striven for consciously and with the help of the will, but also instinctively. Thus, in each given case, just those tricks (often artificial, but frequently real "artistic scenes") and combinations of mental and physical factors, which offer the greatest prospects of success are employed. Such devices may become fixed in the mind and, indeed, automatic methods of action, having a tendentious, hysterical character, take place. The conscious mind is no longer capable of influencing such an action by the will, and, further, the personality of the individual in question is no longer associated with these mechanical processes. Thus, typical hysterical morbid symptoms arise, which must not be considered as symptomatic of hysteria from a clinical point of view (for this does not exist). They only give rise to hysterical conditions and associations based on previously existing combinations and changes of forces.¹

If we return, after a glance over the very wide and obscure field of genuine hysteria, to the narrower confines dealt with in this book, particularly in this chapter, we are bound to come to the conclusion that, broadly speaking, receptivity to hysterical reactions may be based on special traits of character already present in a particularly marked degree. In certain cases, therefore, a character may rightly be termed hysterical. This does not, however, exclude the fact that such receptivity, although less apparent, may also be observed in other types of character if circumstances favour this.

Although hysterical symptoms also occur in men (the

¹ According to *Arthur Kronfeld*, "Psychotherapy," (Julius Springer, Berlin, 1925.)

world war has given us many examples of this), the typical, hysterical disposition is chiefly a feminine phenomenon. The "hysterica" (I admit that this word has no scientific, indeed, not even a sufficiently reasoned clinical diagnosis, but it describes a type well known to medical men) is a common, though unwelcome patient in the physician's consulting room. The "hystericus," on the other hand, is, generally speaking, rarely met with.

An hysterical disposition in a woman means the sure collapse of marriage; even though it may be true that, in certain quite exceptional cases, marriage is mentioned as a cure for hysteria, I do not know of such cases, and a genuine cure, even a permanent improvement, is seriously doubted by experts, or is, indeed, definitely denied. And what becomes, in such cases, of the remedy, the man? History is singularly silent on this point. Even in the most favourable circumstances, one can only speak here of exceptional cases, and the man that allows himself to be caught by an hysterical woman commits a stupidity that he will repent of IN ANY CASE. At the best, his wife can be kept on the right path for a shorter or longer period by good psychotherapeutic treatment. Even if the relationship of mental dependence, in which she turns to her doctor, and the transference of her feelings to him may be far from pleasant for the husband, he will thereby gain the support he needs, and have a certain amount of peace for a short period. Generally speaking, however, this does not last very long. The time comes when the doctor is "no longer any good." Other help must be sought, preferably that of a charlatan, who professes to have occult powers, or the modern cult of spiritualism claims her interest. During all this period the husband must listen to endless stories and protestations, and subject himself to the tyranny which the hysterical woman exercises with persevering tenacity, or, at any rate, tries to exert, completely ruining his joy in life.

Reflection will bring to the mind of anyone at least one case of this nature, and cases are frequent in general medical practice. It is only necessary to recall *Kretschmer's* short sketch, which I have quoted earlier, to see that

married hostility is inevitable in a marriage with an hysterical woman.

As regards the wife, if such an antagonism does not exist at an earlier stage than in the man, it has its origin in the aversion of the man and his active or passive resistances towards her tyrannical lust for power, which has originated or has grown from this hysterical soil. Enmity easily grows from these antagonisms. How many physicians have not had unpleasant, even, indeed, bitter experience of them, and are aware of the "sufferings" of "married hostility"? *Jacob Wassermann's* book, "*Laudin and His Family*," has only to be read to show this clearly.

To the unhealthy jealousy of which we have spoken above, is opposed the jealousy of love which is, to a certain extent, normal. Love seeks response. If this is found, an increased appreciation of the self is brought into being. As soon, however, as there is any danger that another appears more desirable to one of the married pair, this feeling is injured, and doubts arise in the erotic self-consciousness; connected with this, is the fear of the threatened loss, and all sorts of attempts are made, very often exaggerated, to avert the danger. This need not necessarily lead to an estrangement. On the contrary, reasonable jealousy may help to strengthen love. But, if the attempts to avoid danger, which is perhaps only supposed, are too much exaggerated, difficulties may arise between the married pair, which are the beginning of a permanent disturbance of their good relations. A much more serious form of jealousy arises if, behind it, is hidden the feeling of guilt because of unfaithfulness or of a desire to be unfaithful. Such types of jealousy, which are sometimes further complicated by the consciousness of personal shortcomings in regard to the practical erotic side of marriage, may quite easily become unhealthy jealousy.

Here we must devote a word to a form of jealousy that is not sexual, but is more or less connected with sex. It appears particularly in men, and is a product of our times, in which the woman quite often, even if she is married, follows a

profession which, at times, may overshadow that of the man. It is quite understandable that this jealousy, which might better be called envy, may contribute towards an estrangement between the married pair.

The estrangement that may arise between man and wife through their children is of a different nature. Sometimes a certain degree and an element of jealousy may be associated with this. There is absolutely no doubt that children usually form a strong bond between the parents, but, in spite of this, their existence may, in fact, separate the married pair, if the woman neglects the man or the man the woman on account of the children, claiming the whole interest. When, for instance, either the husband or the wife believes that, practically, he or she is regarded only as a means to an end and is nothing more than a breadwinner for the children; or frequent disagreement arises, for instance, with regard to the education of the children; further, when the children themselves intensify the disputes by taking the side of one or the other parent—acting in conjunction with the one against the other, thus weakening instead of strengthening the bond between the parents, and becoming even the cause of ruining the already none too harmonious relations between the parents. The danger to the man in this respect is by no means theoretical; but the woman is much more frequently shipwrecked on this rock. The fault of many women is that they have relatively too much motherly feeling and relatively too little of the feminine, particularly in the erotic and sexual sense. Men are much to blame for this fault.

The causes of married hostility, which we have adduced up to the present, at least (such a pronounced estrangement and disharmony between man and wife that the hostility of the one towards the other is a natural result of it), are all, or nearly all, based on sexual (that is to say, connected with sex) qualities or peculiarities, some of which appear both in men and in women, and others which are formed more frequently among men, or chiefly in women.

In the latter groups is hidden the inclination of many

men to mould their wives to the pattern of their mothers.

This inclination may have its roots in the lower layers of the subconscious, where the erotically tinged bond to the mother still has its effects. They can also be based on the fact that the man may value the qualities of his mother more highly, whom he only partly knows, more than those of his wife—for what does the son know, for instance, of the intimate relations between his mother and his father? It is possible that the general inclination of men to praise the past has also something to do with it. However that may be, dangers to the marriage may arise out of this inclination in the man, particularly when he lets himself be led into quoting his mother as an example at every opportunity suitable or otherwise.

There is a further image into which one of the married partners, particularly when he is still young or inexperienced, often tries to transform the other, that is his *own* image. The more strongly the idealism expressed in the manner of feeling and thinking of a young married pair, the more the two desire to be one in their whole beings, the greater their desire to be all in all to each other, the more will the man strive to educate his wife in his manner of thought, to share his feelings, to take up his attitude in regard to all sorts of things—in short, to change her entirely. The woman will, when she is typically feminine, try, in the beginning, to comply with this desire, but she will not be able to do it wholly, as she thinks and feels in a different manner from the man. Then ambivalence begins to play a part with regard to these feelings and the negative phase, the desire for self humiliation invariably shows an inclination to veer round to the positive, to the desire for personal domination. A struggle for power is the result, internally with herself and, externally, with her husband. Material for dispute gathers on all sides. Disappointments and disillusionment on the part of the man who strives for the impossible, and, similar states arise in the woman, from whom the impossible has been demanded; that is to say, to feel and think like a man. Endless altercations, irritability

that becomes increasingly difficult to overcome, and the loss of the illusion of unattainable harmonious unity, destroy the prospects of happiness which might have been obtained.

If, by this, I displease those who are so zealous for the "equality" between man and woman, I believe that it is still normal, in most marriages, for the woman to adapt herself to a certain extent, to the man, because it is in accordance with the character which has been given, or if you will, imposed upon masculine and feminine, by nature, and because this character cannot be denied without avenging itself.

But the idealistic exaggeration which is the theme of this short examination has, just as much, its revenge. It usually leads through a period of mental tyranny on the part of the man to at least an inner resistance on the part of the woman, and, from this idealism, based on insufficient insight and thus warped from the start, to resentment and, finally, to married hostility.

It is interesting, from more than one point of view, that idealism of a similar nature is an almost typical phenomenon in the first stage of a long engagement. I think this is not difficult to explain.

I precede my remarks by stating that I shall deal with relationships and opinions such as are usual among the broad masses of our civilisation, and leave out of account the relaxation in the "morals of young girls" who belong to a conspicuous, but relatively small part of these masses, because I consider this relaxation to be a passing phase. Apart from this, *these* girls are, in every respect and rightly, never long engaged and are strictly moral during their engagement.

In short, I speak of those couples from whom it is demanded that, before the marriage is solemnized, they go no further than a kiss in their practical relations as lovers, and from whom it is confidently expected that they will really carry out this demand.

If the period of engagement is a short one, no difficulties are encountered. But, if it is long, these difficulties are unavoidable, particularly for the man, more especially if the

engaged pair are much together. The tension which is caused by ever-repeated and ever-interrupted stimuli, which are never concluded in the normal way by relaxation, leads, at the best, to sublimation. This sublimation takes place among relatively very young and idealistically minded men, who are more or less obstinate and do not understand the nature of these things, preferably by transposing the relaxation impulse into the impulse of approach, thereby strengthening it. Only such men contract an engagement which is not followed fairly soon by marriage. This strengthening expressed in the way stated above forms, in addition, a vicious circle. Further, let us add that sometimes repression, with all its consequences, is finally unavoidable in such conditions. Think of the nervous irritability that arises from this; the almost inevitable injurious mutual effects, not omitting the sexual repulsion which certainly makes itself felt, where the sexual impulse is so hindered in its normal course. It is not necessary to probe the depths of the soul of the girl to understand that the inconsiderate idealism of a lengthy engagement more certainly leads to hostility, even before marriage, than marriage itself.

In such cases, marriage is no longer a sufficient cure, even if it finally removes the primary cause of the evil, for the destroying influences have usually been too long at work.

This leads us to the conclusion that, in such circumstances, marriage should not be contracted. But, in practice, this is shown to be incorrect.

The hope that all may still be well; the promise of marriage having been given, and the thought that the woman, if an engagement of long duration has been broken, may then only have slight prospects of being married; the relationships between the two which have now become habitual, the blackness that this brings with it, in that a far greater effort of will is necessary to make a complete rupture than to slip into marriage; the happy memories and the remains of tender feelings, bonds with the respective families and those qualities of character that made such an engagement possible, all combine to prevent an engagement

from being broken off at the last moment. The hostility, that has only concealed itself, then appears during the honeymoon and in married life.

In cases where Nature has proved herself to be stronger than the moral code, there is no need to be a gynæcologist to know that Nature does indeed prove herself to be the stronger even where it is least expected, and, generally speaking, quite frequently and, if the relationships between the lovers during a long engagement have gone decidedly farther than the permitted kiss, the unnatural situation will not thereby be prevented. There can be no question of a normal sexual relationship which is in every way satisfactory. Very often the opportunity is lacking; the fear of pregnancy is far greater than ever in marriage; the feeling of having sinned against the moral laws, against Church and society, is strong at least in the subconscious mind, even if theoretically an entirely "free standpoint" is taken up; the danger of discovery or, at any rate, the danger of a justifiable suspicion, even from the standpoint of the person involved, is great. In many cases, the humiliating thought of having abused parental trust also plays its part. For all these reasons, the position is unsatisfactory in every way, so that, together with the false attitude to the environment, many difficulties of a varied nature are looked for and give rise to reproach, self-reproach and repression, with their ensuing consequences.

The effect of a long engagement is, as regards the origin of antagonism, very much the same, whether the path of righteousness, or the other way, is followed, during this time, by which I certainly do not mean to imply that it is not better to choose the first course, when the choice lies between the two.

I am genuinely convinced, from the point of view of the doctor and of the moralist, that the man who, during his engagement, anticipates conjugal love, commits a psychological error.

No better advice can be given by anyone who knows life and sees the world around him objectively, to an engaged girl, than that given to all girls by *Mephistopheles* in his

serenade: "If you love yourselves, do nothing to pleasure any spoiler, except with the ring on the finger"; naturally, the wedding ring, not the engagement ring!

The psychologist must demonstrate to young people of both sexes, and also to their parents, contrary to the naive belief that a long engagement is a good preliminary to a happy marriage because "the young people have so much opportunity of getting to know each other," that such an engagement lays too heavy a burden on the marriage from the very outset, and that only people with calm, equable dispositions, and a weak degree of sensuality, are capable of a long engagement.

Before we leave the important theme which led us to these explanations, I think it desirable to examine the subject from another point of view. To this end I quote the following sentences from *von Hattingberg's* "Marriage as an Analytical Situation": "This natural compromise (which we spoke about above) is disturbed when we force up the erotic side towards the physical pole—towards 'sensuality'—and, equally when we force it towards the other pole, when we connect, with the desire for love, the demand for absolute understanding. The result of such an urge within oneself until complete mental fusion is reached is a permanent condition of mental sexual desire which goes on increasing constantly. The higher the degree of sensitiveness, the sooner will neglect cause disillusion which demands fresh ecstasy, for one person can only be entirely merged in the other for a moment. But, above all, marriage, on account of this claim, becomes an analytical situation in the most dangerous sense of the term. When the one reacts to every emotion of the other, the action and repercussions are reciprocally strengthened, and this reaction destroys the natural limits of the ego. Love finally exists only from self-defence, and the 'hatred between the sexes' flares up redoubled between man and woman. This most hidden of misunderstandings in marriage signifies the seed of destruction of the self." It will be observed that the exponent of psycho-analysis comes roughly to the same conclusion as a

result of a demonstration which, to a large extent, runs parallel with my line of thought.

Most of the factors that may cause disharmony in marriage have been dealt with in earlier chapters, and partly also in "Ideal Marriage," and we would only repeat ourselves if we considered them once again.

It is, therefore, sufficient to draw attention to the difficulties connected with the mutual satisfaction of the sexual desires of each of the partners, and, apart from this, we would emphasise that both forced sexual connection and its refusal may arouse hatred.

We shall now consider those dangers in which the married pair may be involved in the æsthetics side of marriage, if they do not maintain a certain reserve toward each other regarding all sorts of unæsthetic facts of life, and the care of the body.

Very often the men and the women do not consider this point of view sufficiently. This is no specific phenomenon, but only a part of the general changes in the behaviour of most people when they live for a long period in close connection with each other. They think that there is no need to stand on ceremony with each other—an expression of a characteristic human inclination to let things slide as soon as they are not forced by circumstances, or for other reasons, to be on their best behaviour. Do we not observe this tendency also among certain animals? One has only to think of the different attitudes and movements of a horse when it must, or wishes, to take itself in hand, or when it allows itself to do what it wishes—but do not let us digress. Most people only take care of their appearances when the outside world makes it necessary. The number of women and men who also keep up their manners towards each other, and who, when they are alone, behave just as if they were with others, is relatively small. It is necessary to have a great deal of internal control, to be accustomed to strict discipline and be extremely well educated, and, above all, to have had exceptional breeding, to be able to keep one's manners under all conditions and not to deviate in this. The

conditions that make the greatest claims with regard to this are those of the daily round, and particularly the daily association between the married pair. Many sins are committed in this respect in that no trouble is taken when husband and wife are together, and the one does not do his or her best to please the other in dress, in the way of arranging the hair, and in other external things, and in trying to show himself or herself in every respect from one's best side. In marriage, it is most necessary to keep a perpetual account of these things, for the everyday little worries which arise from insufficient mutual consideration between the married pair contribute, to a large extent, to strengthening and developing disharmony, and such worries, even if they have no particular form, may definitely give rise to specific aversion.

It can, therefore, be understood how important good breeding and, later, education is in this for the future partners in marriage.

Its importance is materially increased because well-brought-up people remain in control of themselves, in discussions, in disputes, in expressions of anger, and even when they are violently agitated, and their uncontrolled remarks which are not made very often disturb good understanding and frequently are the cause of estrangement in marriage.

Such people, therefore, who have the necessary amount of self-control run fewer risks in marriage than those who let themselves go. When we also consider that those who have had a good education in childhood, live later, when they are married, in more favourable material conditions, so that various causes of dispute and irritation are not present, and that in addition to this they can quite easily keep out of each other's way when such irritations arise between such people we are forced to conclude that marriage runs less risk of being a failure than between those who live under less favourable conditions.

This deduction, however, is not supported by experience. It is quite true that, under such conditions, circumstances do not so easily arise which turn marriage into a torture, and

the conditions of life are, in such cases, more favourable than they are in general. But it is an illusion that married hostility appears here less frequently than usual.

It would no doubt be very interesting to inquire into the causes of this phenomenon. We cannot, however, stop to discuss this matter further, and confine ourselves to the statement that the factors that we have spoken about, important as they are for married life (particularly when it has already been disturbed), are only of subsidiary interest in regard to the origin of married hostility, and are not of essential importance.

The influence of certain traits must also be considered as subsidiary, even if they are present to such an extent in the man and the woman that we have to term them defects of character, and because of this are of no less importance for the relationship in marriage than the specifically sexual and essentially conjugal factors.

An ancient proverb, which first appeared in print 400 years ago (1527), says: "Man has peace only as long as his neighbour allows it."

And, as men do not alter in a few centuries, the proverb still holds good.

But, whoever lives under the same roof with a neighbour who does not want peace (who is always ready to attack, sudden to anger, irritable, impatient, quarrelsome, moody, defiant, irreconcilable, sulky, or churlish, boorish, inconsiderate, sharp and hard) to a large extent in the same room, and at the same table, must sometimes quarrel with him, and cannot keep permanently good relations with him, even if he had such marvellous qualities that they border on the impossible. Whoever carries on a partnership (and this, too, is marriage) with a partner who is lazy and untruthful, extravagant, far too fond of pleasure and egoistic, will find it takes a great amount of energy (impossible in the course of time) invariably to have a benevolent regard for this partner, to whom he is allied by some inconsidered action.

Even if the traits of character we have thus mentioned which make peaceful living together almost impossible are

not found combined in the one person, there are, nevertheless, many people who possess one or more of these defective qualities to such an extent, or so co-ordinated, that their capacity as a husband or wife suffers definitely from them. That the existence of such qualities in one of the partners, and far more in both of them, is of importance in causing married hostility, is obvious.

With regard to the great importance which the struggle for domination in its various phases has for the relations between the sexes in general, and for marriage in particular, I have already said so much that very little more needs to be added. I must, however, point out that this struggle is not exclusively the result of sexual motives, however much these motives influence the associations between a man and a woman.

The fight for hegemony is found everywhere where two or more persons live in community with each other. It is immaterial whether they are two friends or two partners, a number of girls or boys in a school, or the members of a club, whether the leadership of a political party is at stake, or the domination of a party group in a State is at issue, or, finally, the hegemony of a State above all other States. Whenever animals are found living together in groups, this struggle may be observed also in the same typical forms, and one must agree with *Thorlief Schjelderup-Ebbe* that the element of contention, in these circumstances, comes under the laws of group psychology which hold good everywhere.

These laws have been investigated by the author mentioned above in a great number of species of birds, and, in particular, the hen.¹

His observations are extremely interesting, especially when they are considered from the point of view of comparative psychology.

The desire for power and social rank is seen everywhere.

¹ Contributions to the Social Psychology of the Common Hen, *Review for Psychology*, Vol. 88, 1922; further contributions to the Social and Individual Psychology of the Common Hen, *Review for Psychology*, Vol. 92, 1923; The Social Psychology of Birds, *Review for Psychology*, Vol. 95, 1924.

There is no case in which two hens (and in numerous other species that have been studied it is exactly the same) live together without deciding which of them (as *Thorlief Schjelderup-Ebbe* expresses it) shall be "the despot." Physical strength and brute force do not, by any means, entirely decide the matter. Mental qualities, too, such as courage and daring, are of great influence. It is probable that it is owing to this that the first meeting is of such great importance for the future social position of the animal. A change in the social status once it has been fixed (which is demonstrated by the fact that the "despot" drives off the vanquished, and that the beaten animal allows itself to be pecked, clawed at and driven off) only occurs through individual revolt against the despot, and this is very rare. Usually, the beaten animal adapts itself to the circumstances, and the relationship to its despot receives something of an authoritative character.¹

Would not one imagine that here relationships between human beings were being described? But, among men, civilised men, the fight for domination MAY end in a compromise more often than among the animals (though this is by no means impossible). The struggle may end with a limitation of the sphere of influence, the toleration of the superiority of the rival in his appointed sphere, and the common exercise of power over third persons. Thus in such a way develops, for example, the relations between two partners—that relationship which may be most easily compared with that existing between a married pair, if we leave the sexual factors out of account for a moment—when they have shown themselves to be equally strong, and their rivalry has not ended in permanent disharmony.

Is such a compromise possible as a final result of the mental struggle for domination between husband and wife? I am inclined to doubt this, even if such a solution is stated to occur, and even to be desirable, by women whose seriousness and veracity cannot be doubted.

¹ Details may be found in an article by *David Katz*, "Social Psychology of Birds," in the first volume of the Handbook by *von Frisch* and others. "Biological Findings." (Julius Springer, Berlin, 1926.)

In my opinion, authoresses are wrong in their explanation of the position—permanent equality—which they hold to be a *genuine* and *final* compromise in regard to hegemony in the marriage, this because in such cases compromise is *not genuine*, but is only apparently, and, in truth, a disguised victory on the part of the woman, or because it is found not to be final. Even if, in the struggle between the married partners for domination, the non-sexual side is eliminated by a compromise this is not the case as far as the sexual side, which is by far the more important of the two, is concerned.

Sexuality is always present in man and woman, and upper and lower place is inseparably allied with it. It is no matter of chance that the relationships in a mental or physical struggle, as well as in sexual connection, are expressed in these words. Therefore, the struggle for power between a man and a woman who come into close relationship with each other must be fought out until the bitter end; until hostility arises (which is no compromise, but a respite, indefinitely postponed), after which the pair will avoid each other, as far as possible; or until one has been victorious and the other has been defeated, or, better expressed, until one has reached in subordination the joyous peace of a negative consciousness of power.

Naturally, this is true in a still greater measure if the closer relationships between man and woman show a clearly erotic or indeed a practical sexual character.

For the final result of the marriage it is by no means the same if the decision in the fight for domination comes relatively soon, or is preceded by a long, stubborn struggle, full of unpleasant experiences. In the latter case, the bitterness of the struggle, and all that is connected with it, can contribute so greatly to the origin of married hostility, and leave behind it such unforgettable impressions, that the final clarification of the situation can only temporarily arrest the process of destruction which has begun. The typical origin of married hostility was understood quite rightly by the strongly developed intuition of *H. v. B.*, whose case I quoted at the beginning of this book. He gave expression to this in the short monodrama in which he unburdened

his troubled heart : " Like everything that lives, love, too, carries the seed of decay in itself."

But marriage, the living together, remains even if love fades. As soon as love is no longer capable of lending its glamour to married life, and when it can no longer bridge the abyss which separates masculine and feminine, the repulsion between the two sexes arises and is no longer repressed, while the numerous difficulties of married life, the avoidance of which make every harmonious association an art, only these are seen in their true colours.

This state of affairs is intensified the more the married pair expect from their marriage, and the more they have adapted their lives entirely to their love.

Herein lies the germ of disillusionment, of just those marriages that have been contracted on the highest ideals. *H. v. B.* makes his hero say : " My whole being is based on our love. I have sacrificed everything to it." It appears from a previous scene, that I have not quoted, which contains the confessions of the woman before her marriage, that her husband gave up his *work* to carry through the marriage, while she sacrificed, to her relationship with him, her love to her parents and everything that was, otherwise, dear to her in life.

Madness !—blessed beautiful, intoxicating madness—but in spite of everything, madness !

" If the man has no purpose for his days, then to the woman alone remains the goal of her nights ; the great sex goal. And this goal is no goal but always cries for the something beyond ; for the rising in the morning and the going forth beyond, the man disappearing ahead into the distance of futurity, that which his purpose stands for—the future. The sex goal needs, absolutely needs, this further departure. And if there be no further departure, no great way of belief on ahead, and if sex is the starting-point and the goal as well ; then sex becomes like the bottomless pit, insatiable. It demands at last, the departure into death, the only available beyond . . . death is the only pure beautiful conclusion of a great passion. Lovers, pure lovers, should say. Let it be so."

The final conclusion of *D. H. Lawrence's* "Fantasia of the Unconscious"¹ is that which has been reached, and always will be reached, by all writers of love dramas.

Eros-Thanatos! There remains only *one* solution; death as the apex of love, the love death in whatever form it may take, for those who desire to proceed to the furthest limits in their experience of love or in creating stories of love. This also applies to those who, unlike the writers of comedies, do not stop where the real love life, with the internal and external conflicts associated with it, begins, and to those lovers and creators of lovers who refuse to expose themselves to the almost degrading feeling of seeing the passion that was their whole life fade, wither and become an object of derision.

Our "patient" (Henry von B.) also, when he made the hero of his waking dream choose the love-death, saw that this solution was irresistible.

But, in reality, life—the wish to preserve life—is stronger than the desire for the love-death, stronger than love, stronger than death itself. That is nature's law. If it were otherwise, love would prevent the propagation of life instead of guaranteeing it. Henry von B. bowed to this law in acting differently to the hero in his drama. Fatal results may arise from too little insight, too exaggerated an ideal of love on the part of the lovers, in particular if their marriage is based on false premises.

The overwhelming, almost pathological phase of love is only of limited duration.

"Contradire l'amour, c'est le rendre invincible,
Mais Laissez faire au temps; Lui, qui surmonte tout,
De cette passion pourra venir à bout."²

The man who fashions his life as if the overwhelming emotions of love were a *permanent* condition of the mind is building upon sand. For however great a place love may occupy in marriage and in life (the reader of "Ideal Marriage" will agree that I have no intention of belittling

¹ Martin Secker, London, 1924.

² *P. du Ryer*, "Les Vendanges de Suresnes," Act 4, Scene 9.

the importance of this place), the man's thoughts inevitably return to his work, and those of the woman, to a great extent, to the child.

The lack of insight that prevents people from understanding this truth and adapting their life to it in time is, together with the natural waning of love, almost a physiological cause of the origin of married hostility for the majority of people.

Meanwhile, even before love begins to fade, friction in conjugal life may cause estrangement between the married pair.

"Few things are so harmful to love and a man's fidelity as not to know what sort of atmosphere he will find at home." This was once written by a clever woman in her collection of aphorisms. The phrase is true, although it should not be forgotten that a man's moods can also be intolerable.

It is self-evident that the unfavourable qualities of character previously cited can also contribute, to a large extent, to friction, and often, indeed, to quarrels. There may not even be defects of character. It is well known that incompatibility of temperament is a cause of married discord. The *lack of tact* or of *insight* and thus of *goodwill*, which shows that the persons in question cannot be reconciled and that no compromise can be reached by mutual yielding, is all the more striking and, therefore, depressing, since experience teaches us that opposites attract each other in love. Such attraction can surprise the biologist least of all, for he sees everywhere in nature the attempt to conserve the typical average qualities of the species by the mating of extremes.

The state of mind influences all this very greatly, the combination of those feelings which sometimes penetrate the conscious mind, but far more often remain in the subconscious, and are the primary factors determining the relationship between two people.

Is there reciprocal action between the subconscious minds?

Who knows?—It will be some time yet before such action can be irrefutably proved. Personally I have good reason to believe that reciprocal action really does frequently occur.

We know well enough how much irritability can affect the spirits of everyone and thus the spirits of husband and wife. We must remember, in this connection, that in the life of a man there are many reasons for irritability owing to the continuous, very often over-great, tension demanded of him, and owing to the numerous conflicts he is frequently bound to have with the outside world. Further, woman has just as much reason for irritability in the numerous small annoyances of daily life (not to speak of the external struggle for existence that many women of our time are forced to carry on), particularly during periods in which she is specially prone to this. We should always bear in mind that in these matters man and woman cannot entirely understand one another, and, still more, do not *wish* to understand one another, each only thinking from their own point of view. We can now see clearly that the good relationship between husband and wife may be ruined again and again by these things.

But enough! Shall I again repeat that the pressure of marriage may bring about a state of affairs in weak natures in which husband and wife are always ready to depreciate the other, in order to retain the feeling of his or her own worth?—this is observable in a very unpleasant sort of rudeness in the man (owing to "embarrassment"), and in the woman who thinks she is far too good for her husband and her duties (and acts accordingly!). Is it necessary again to state the fact that husband and wife gradually lose sympathy for each other's interests, to show how a woman can drive a man out of the house with her complaints over household trivialities, and how a man can bring his wife to despair by unnecessary niggardliness; to bring forward proofs of respective importance and in regard to every possible kind of rivalry; or to point out that the man does not sufficiently appreciate all the woman does, and that the woman does not interest herself enough in his profession, in which she often sees only the boring "details"

and "pettinesses" without understanding the broader lines of his work?—must I describe how the man and the woman, when they have reached a certain stage in married hostility, unceasingly irritate each other in everything, voluntarily or involuntarily?—and also attempt to catalogue the thousand and one ways in which two people who cannot abide each other any longer can, almost invariably, make life unpleasant for each other?—finally, shall I analyse in detail one of the most insufferable things that one person can do to another—to bore him?

I have not the courage to do this, particularly as we have mentioned the word "boredom."

I cannot let *Voltaire's* warning, "the secret of boredom is to tell everything," pass unheeded, even although my aim is to be as complete as possible, because I believe that I have, in the previous pages, sufficiently explained the origin of married hostility, and that we can now proceed to deal with its prevention.

INTERMEZZO OF APHORISMS¹

I

We are sexual beings; this is a proof that we are finite bearers of infinite life.

J. G. Wattjes.

II

To define a man: He must make me feel that I am a woman.

Glyn.

III

There are two things women never forgive: sleep and business.

Voltaire.

IV

A woman knows but love and hate. She rarely knows a middle course.

Cats.

¹ I must point out that, in inserting a number of aphorisms between the principal parts of this book, my intention is to provide more than a slight literary entertainment. Those who compare these aphorisms with a series of pictures, recalling to the mind of the reader what has been previously said, and enabling him to understand the second part of the book, will have rightly grasped my purpose. Pictures and aphorisms may be of great suggestive force. They may be hurriedly looked over, but certain of them may be referred to again and considered in detail. I hope my readers will choose the latter method of approach.

V

Woman's mood vacillates like air and wind. Sad for the man who knows so little of moods.

Most men know little of melody. A pity for the woman who entrust themselves to them for harmony.

Text of an Eighteenth Century Aria.

VI

Woman's right place is within ; man's right place is without. Nature's greatest principle is that man and woman should keep their right places.

Confucius.

VII

Woman's power is the opposite of man's power ; power in man is force ; power in woman is weakness.

M.

VIII

To whatever heights humanity may develop, however essentially and comprehensively the mental functions dominate, and will dominate more and more the sexuality of mankind, the law of the love life will always remain closely associated with the physical events in the sexual sphere, with sexuality in its narrower sense.

Mathilde von Kemnitz.

IX

The purest expression of a woman's life is motherhood. In this mother love, which is not motivated by the qualities of its object, but which radiates creatively, is manifested most plainly, the particular form of activity necessary to the feminine soul for life for its own sake, in caring for and looking after others.

Else Voigtländer.

X

But in the soul of the woman all the strings sound at the vibration of one single string. Her soul is like still, clear water, in which the slightest movement of wave on wave sends forth ripples to the furthest limits.

Wilhelm von Humboldt.

XI

When a woman says that she wishes to "live her own life," it means that she renounces life as it presents itself to her in order to live a dream.

"Les Cahiers anonymes," II

XII

Good women are made, not born.

M.

XIII

He only cares for that love which does not seek its own, that is most itself when it is most deeply wrapped up in the other, which has not been warped internally by something imitated and adapted, which is strong enough and original enough to be able to surrender its entire self.

He who has found such a person in his wanderings through life . . . has lived !

For what a person has been to another in deep community of the being is indestructible, and in this lives the breath of the eternal. The one comes to exist always more deeply in the life of the other, and the one becomes always greater and more perfect through the other. . . .

Records of an Idealist.

XIV

The true woman ? It is her talent to awaken and absorb all that is good and noble in the man.

Tolstoy.

XV

Inasmuch as people believe in each other, they give to each other the truth of God and are sources of power to each other. Inasmuch as they do not trust each other, they encounter the deficiency of the other.

Lhotzky.

XVI

The same things leave us unmoved ; it is contradiction that makes us productive.

Goethe.

XVII

Women allow us to enter hell through the gates of Paradise.

St. Cyprian.

XVIII

Man's work is his life.

Margarete Sussmann.

XIX

A good woman will seek the protection of her husband to avoid the love that she feels for another.

From A Woman's Diary.

XX

Man's narrow life requires two feelings : love and hate.

Goethe.

XXI

The separating abyss which nature has created between the sexes, guarantees permanence to the varied play of powerful mutual attraction, in the atmosphere hovering between.

Rabindranath Tagore.

XXII

The very foundation of a happy marriage for man and woman is the dominance of the man desired by the woman.

M.

XXIII

The apprenticeship of the husband and wife which occurs during the first years of marriage is the hardest school of all if considered aright. To be a husband or a wife is a profession, and one must take the trouble to master it. The prize is worth the effort.

"L'Accord Conjugal" (Anonymous).

XXIV

There is an old proverb that when two people get married they ought to have two bears in the house—viz., "bear" and "forebear"; a very good advice.

Letters of a Widowed Physician to his Daughter on her Marriage.

XXV

The wisest of all virtues is forgiveness.

Ilse Heye.

XXVI

You never progress so far in evil as when you do not know whither you are going.

Cromwell.

XXVII

Devotion that is only given on condition that it is reciprocated is not love. Whoever is not ready or capable of true devotion will always be disappointed in his marriage.

J. G. Wattjes.

XXVIII

Love does not mean demanding; it means giving.

Latzko.

XXIX

He to whom a lucky lot has fallen in marriage lives a happy life, but whoever has drawn an evil fate is a child of misery both outside and at home.

Euripides.

XXX

Mea Culpa.

You see, really my great mistake was to have laden your heart with all the burdens of my life. The day on which we knew we loved, I believed that in this heart offered to me, I could enclose my whole universe. We suffer now from this profound mistake. One cannot hold the world in one brain.

Paul Géraudy.

XXXI

If man is the slave and woman the lord, it is a perverse and false bond ; but, if the woman follows the guidance of the man, the bond is good and right.

St. Augustine.

XXXII

The house is turned entirely upside down when the cock is silent and the hen crows.

Cats.

XXXIII

Real tolerance of the frailties of others is the best education for self-criticism.

Ilse Heye.

XXXIV

The hour is brittle and fragile : be tender !

Maeterlinck.

XXXV

The only thing that can ruin men is to believe in ruin.

Martin Buber.

XXXVI

Life is what we imagine it to be. We must not reach the depressing conclusion because of this truth, that life is only an illusion, but understand the infinitely joyful truth that we have the power to make life what we wish it to be.

L. van Deyssel.

XXXVII

To be happy is an art, and is meritorious in itself.

Th. V.

SECOND SECTION

PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

To understand all, is to avoid all

CHAPTER IX

INTRODUCTION TO PROPHYLAXIS—APOLOGIA OF MARRIAGE— MAN AND WOMAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES

"To understand all, is to forgive all," says the well-known proverb, which is based on the wise love of one's neighbour.

I wonder why there is no corollary to this such as "to understand all, is to avoid all"? For that is no less true; and, provided that there is the same sympathetic mental attitude, it is just as desirable and even better to understand how to avoid, as to understand how to forgive. The former makes much more claim on the difficult art of self-mastery than the latter. That prevention, in other respects also, should be placed much higher than cure is a truism that has been recognized everywhere at all times. Therefore, we will seek to combat married hostility, the real theme of this book, by attempting to prevent it.

But prevention premises understanding, and sometimes this comes of itself.

We devoted so much space to the first part of the book, in order to impart this understanding.

Consequently, we shall precede the following explanations by a comprehensive summary of those arguments that we have dealt with up to the present.

Married hostility is determined by three groups of factors—the specifically sexual, the particular problems of marriage, and the non-specific problems that also arise.

To the first group belong above all, primary sexual hostility, and secondary sexual repulsion caused by the reversal of sexual attraction, which because they stand in direct relationship to the sexual feelings and functions (in the narrower sense of the words), may be described as direct sexual aversion. This makes itself felt sooner or later, to a greater or lesser degree, in the relationship between a man and a woman, particularly if it is no longer dominated by the sexual impulse.

Indirect sexual aversion belongs also to this group. It may so be termed because it is brought about by the mental contrast between masculine and feminine, which, although dominated by sex, is not based directly on the sexual functions.

The first group of factors leads, therefore, to the origin of specific aversion between man and woman, which strives for dominance with specific attraction, the sexual impulse, and, in particular, with the impulse of approach. This aversion is usually overcome temporarily, but actually remains the stronger.

But, since the impulse of approach is more aggressive in character and makes itself, at least for a certain time, powerfully felt in the lives of most people—as opposed to aversion which tends to remain passive and elusive and is only relatively seldom seen in its stronger manifestations—it is therefore much more noticeable in the association between the sexes. Thus, it appears to be the more powerful of the two, and this usually leads to wrong conclusions in regard to the nature of the relationships between the sexes both generally and in individual cases.

The particular marriage factors are found in the intimate life together, in the dependence on one another of two people, entirely differently constituted from each other, thinking and feeling differently, and not understanding one another. Further, in the binding nature of this life together, and in the resulting reaction manifested by

a readiness to rebel against this pressure. Again, in lack of sexual freedom, even if there is an entire absence of sexual harmony, and, finally, in the continuous friction and irritability, that result from all this.

The struggle for dominance might also be adduced, but this, just as friction and irritability, does not form part of those problems specifically relating to marriage. For, although this struggle makes itself particularly strongly felt in married life, it can be observed everywhere where two or more people live together in close association.

These points, therefore, form the connecting links to the additional non-specific accidental factors which exert their influences in the cases just mentioned. Conjugal life is of course and indeed primarily included in these cases. But the factors referred to here cannot be considered as more than characteristic for this special form of union. Therefore, we call them "accidental," but this does not mean that they should not be regarded as of great importance as far as the origin of married hostility is concerned.

The personal qualities determined by character, education, custom, point of view and attitude towards life, and the agreement or lack of agreement in this respect, decide the issue here.

In the milder forms of married hostility, which may be termed normal to a certain extent, only a relatively small number of the factors mentioned have any real effect, and generally appear only intermittently (for example, certain of the last group and also indirect sexual aversion). In cases which have already reached a more serious stage, nearly all of them come into play, even if it may also happen that in some points there are clear symptoms of hostility, while, from other aspects, the attraction is still very strong.

To the latter cases belong, for instance, those marriages which are inexplicable to the ignorant and unreflecting outside world in which, in spite of obvious and barely concealed quarrels resulting in hostility, there remains, for a long period, a very strong bond.

These are marriages between temperamental people in which there is absolute harmony in the practical sexual plane, and absolute lack of mental agreement.

The opposite also occurs, but it is in the nature of things that it should be much rarer. This will be understood by anyone who has any knowledge of the sexual feelings of men and women, and who has enquired to a certain extent into the masculine and feminine personality. He will not be astonished that such cases *appear* to be more common than is actually the case. Such a person sees the purport of the play, that both the actors, the "intelligent woman" (a part that has always been a favourite with the actresses on the stage of life, and which particularly interests them at the present time when everything is generalized) and the "well meaning man," wholly bound up in his work, perform to each other, the onlooker and the public generally. For this reason, he does not fall from his heaven of illusions, when he sees such an idyll destroyed, sometimes, at the least expected moment, by an elementary outburst of long suppressed feelings.

Married hostility can be caused by either of the groups of factors we have quoted, or by one or certain of the particular factors in one of the groups. In the cases that occur relatively early and soon become serious, the primary cause is often to be found in the direct sexual plane or in one of the accidental factors, particularly in traits of character of one or both of the partners. On the other hand, in those cases where it occurs relatively late and becomes chronically progressive, it is occasioned more by the indirect sexual opposition, which, when it once breaks out, is strengthened very rapidly by certain of the accidental factors. These are cases in which sexual and erotic attraction suppress both that opposition and also the separating influence of the factors mentioned, and, in fact, cover them over with the cloak of love, but which show themselves incapable of permanent duration, because they gradually weaken. "That is just the point," I hear my readers

say, at the end of this recapitulation. "You admit that married hostility is decided by fate: it must come in one way or another, sooner or later. Be logical, and have the courage to recognize, with us, that marriage is based on wrong assumption—the possibility, indeed the probability, of a permanent good understanding between the married pair. Abandon this creation of society, as we have, and help us to replace it by some plan for regulating sexual relationships that will better take into account the nature of human beings." One of those idealists who believes in simplicity of thought, and who is convinced that the difficulties of life would be relatively easily avoided if only human beings were ready to make the necessary changes in the existing social order of things, might talk in such a manner.

My answer is NO—and again NO !

I contest that my statements must lead to this conclusion, that another and less rigid settlement of sexual relations between man and woman would offer more prospects of happiness than marriage.

In its milder stages and in its intermittent form (that is to say, appearing only from time to time), married hostility is, in fact, inevitable. We must, as long as it manifests itself only in this way, consider it as a normal phenomenon, and, still more, as wholesome.

It is necessary, because the bow of married life, just as other bows, cannot always be kept taut.

It is good, because an occasional decrease in the attraction, the result of this mild repulsion, leads later to a strengthening of the attraction. Indeed, this changing play of attraction and repulsion is conducive to the increase of attraction in time, if it remains within proper limits and if the attraction is always dominant. The contrast that such a mild hostility creates, results in the fact that the married pair become really conscious of the intensity of their love, sympathy and attachment.

It is salutary, because it prevents people from becoming too deeply concentrated on each other, and prevents the loss of personality.

It works as a wholesome remedy in strengthening the attraction and acting as a counter-poise against the enervating influence of uninterrupted agreement. For human beings are so constituted that a certain amount of opposition is necessary to make them display their full powers, and contrasts are necessary to keep their interest alive and avert boredom.

And, with regard to the determination by fate of married hostility in its most serious degree? Certainly, this occurs! but only to men and women who do not oppose it, who cannot really understand either themselves, or their partner, who know the true meaning of marriage just as little as they know life, who only seek their own ends and are incapable of true surrender, who do not know that, particularly in marriage, it is more blessed to give than to receive.

This does *not* happen, on the other hand, to men and women who have knowledge and understanding, who recognise the enemy and look him straight in the face confidently, strong in the purpose that they shall not be conquered.

For married hostility can always be prevented or subdued by those who have the goodwill to do so—unless either one of the partners shows such really bad qualities that no one can live for long together with him or her, or that abnormalities are present.

As far as free love, compared with marriage, is concerned, such a relationship becomes, in regard to the possibility of the occurrence of married hostility, absolutely similar to marriage, as soon as love is no longer a passing fancy, or merely an episode. An example of this in poetry is shown in *Paul G raldy's* cycle "*Toi et moi.*" No one with any depth of feeling can lay aside this book without a sense of sadness.

That a real love relationship becomes more than an episode, I have no need to prove to any person who has experienced it, and that, on the contrary, an erotic relation-

ship, which lasts only for a short time, cannot satisfy the needs of love. Even those who do not know what love means—the girl or young man who have hardly grown out of the stage of undifferentiated love—intuitively are aware of this.

The need for love, that is to say not merely the desire to satisfy the sexual and erotic impulses, but to combine these with the numerous factors more or less related to them, and with those other asexual factors that are not associated, form that wide conception we term *love*—that conception that no one has been able rightly to define, which has a different meaning for every person and in every case and yet is a conception that all understand. This need is so strong that it cannot be suppressed, or only with great difficulty.

In love there is the urge towards the infinite.

The line "Oh Lord, grant that we grow old together," which appears in an old marriage prayer, shows a deeper insight into the real needs of the human heart than do those who cry out for trial marriages, or for a liaison protected by the law.

Marriage alone—and even then only a bond that is really felt as marriage and is thus in agreement with the religious ceremony, not only in the letter but in the spirit as well—is made to last. Only such a love relationship which is made to endure and believes in its permanence, can really satisfy the need of love.

This is not all. The man and woman who consider that the bond of love existing between them can be easily broken, will make little or no endeavour to prevent or combat the hostility which threatens married life equally with free love. They will allow things to slide, are far more prone to see approaching destiny in the primary symptoms, and will break off their relations as the evil intensifies. They will not notice, however, until it is too late, that this separation cannot be affected without mental damage to both parties, and such a defect makes itself felt long afterwards. This is true naturally, only of genuine love alliances. We are not dis-

cussing here fleeting sexual relationships. They cannot be compared either with love in married life, or with a free alliance, as they do not, even temporarily, make the parties truly happy.

What, for instance, is the result of breaking off a free love alliance? New liaisons of a similar nature take the same course, and, after a certain number of such experiments, comes discouragement and absolute aversion to the opposite sex, or an ever decreasing capacity for true love, the search for the erotic and, finally, mere sexual substitutes—always of a degrading nature. These results will certainly ensue if—in this downward road and ere it is too late—insight does not come, insight of the fact that a love alliance which is not meant to be permanent robs man and woman of a most important possibility for their mental development, and for their striving upwards, to a standard of perfection which a permanent marriage alone can give.

Thus, the question whether the fact that all marriages are more or less menaced by married hostility should lead to the abandonment of this arrangement and its substitution by a more easily soluble bond between man and woman, is, in my opinion, already decided in the negative sense, without it being necessary to make use of the religious and political arguments which are no less cogent, resulting from the real interests of the women and children. However valuable and however important these arguments may be, the motives that have to be examined in an apologia of marriage are by no means exhausted, a defence which, in spite of all "married hostility," should be convincing and can be convincing. There is the argument based on the fact that marriage is a "task" (in the double meaning of work that must be performed and of a problem that must be solved), and that "the solution of tasks, work alone, makes people happy."¹ I entirely agree with this sentence and would put it together with one of my own aphorisms:

¹ *Wilhelm Sauer*, "The Philosophy of the Future." (Ferdinand Enke, Stuttgart, 1923.)

"All happiness must be worked for, particularly happiness in marriage."

There is, further, another argument in addition to the one we have mentioned. That is the fruitful influence on the mind of marriage resulting from the suggestive effect which the married partners exercise on each other, an effect which, as we have seen previously, may, indeed, be unfavourable, but, on the other hand, may do also a great deal of good.

There is also the argument of the great binding power exercised by the community of interests in marriage, particularly if it leads to a real combination, work and responsibility being correctly divided, even if this is limited, as it often is in less developed people, to the struggle for existence, and the desire to succeed, or if it is, and unfortunately this is much too rare, on a high mental plane.

There is still another argument which makes it apparent that no other relationship, except that which is found in marriage, makes possible the combination of the satisfaction of the gregarious and the sexual impulses—a motive which, I believe, is one of the most important. The human being does not only feel in himself the need to satisfy both these impulses, but also feels the urge to direct them in one particular way, to combine them and to concentrate them on one particular object, so that there arises from this a personal need and impulse towards marriage.

There are many other reasons. But the principal argument, which is the basis of all, is that marriage is a union of two into one—a union of a higher nature. We find this argument expressed in all its varying shades in the works of philosophers of all kinds and in all countries; in China, nearly 5,000 years ago, in the ancient, as in the modern world; in people who have passed middle age and who are well versed in wordly wisdom, and among young people who have no experience of love and life.

Indeed, relatively very young people, who are just beginning to conceive what it means to love, have the feeling which springs from the deepest layers of the sub-

conscious, that the beloved,¹ of whom he has been deprived so long, is the other half of himself. This feeling is so noticeable, so strong and so widespread, and such a general phenomenon, that many who reflect on it will wonder if it is not an expression of the unconscious (of the collective unconscious).

To consider marriage as a union of a higher order—as an independent organisation, as I have termed it already in my first book—in which married partners are merged, even if each keeps his or her own personality; to reach the common consciousness demanded and created by this union; to be convinced and constantly to strengthen the conviction that the happiness of this union is of far more value to the partners than the fulfilment of all egotistic desires; *only thus can a married couple solve, in a positive sense, the conflict which exists between them, concerning the need for marriage and the repulsion which man and woman exercise on each other.*

If a symbol is needed to reproduce in the above sense the relationship between men and women to each other and to marriage, it may be found in *Keyserling's* most important essay, which is, unfortunately, not easily understandable for most people, "The Problem of Marriage Correctly Formulated," in his "Book of Marriage." Here he compares the marriage union to an elliptic field of force having two foci, which can never merge into each other, which can never fuse into one another and whose polar tension cannot be taken away if the field of force is to remain in existence.

Those who, like myself, prefer to return to the starting point of their consideration, if they attempt to bring into agreement *Kipling's* "East is East and West is West," and the remarks connected with it on man and woman with what has just been discussed, will welcome the following

¹ It is very often emphatically stated that the deprivation and search occasioned by this feeling has lasted far longer than life itself.

somewhat abbreviated quotation from *J. Reitsma's* essay, "East and West."¹

I can leave it to the reader to discover the relationship between these thoughts and our considerations which are more or less closely connected.

"If we may regard men and women as the two most important groups of humanity, the ancient wisdom of the Chinese impresses us particularly. One of the sacred writings of the Chinese upon which Confucius comments is the "I-Ging." The main idea in this book is the following: "The whole universe is made up of two polar principles which are formed from one, Tai-Gi. These polarities call forth, by means of their various interconnections, the infinite majority of all phenomena associated with all beings and of all things in the universe. Later, Yang-Yin was developed from this as a complete philosophic system. Yang was the masculine, Yin the feminine principle; both of these, Yang and Yin, were formed through and from the unrevealed unity Tai-Gi, and thus proceeded mystically from one and the same basic principle.

Thus West and East, the masculine and the feminine half of humanity, form a whole and are one originally. The left and right half, which are, in themselves, so different, form a body, just as the two infinite orbits of stars which move in opposing directions, produce a universe.

The unrevealed stands above the polar masculine and feminine principles, making its own confines as it revealed itself.

Where love is expressed as an impulse towards unity and consciousness of unity, where the inhabitant of the western half of the world expresses the impulse towards unity, and the Oriental the consciousness of unity, one can then say that East and West, the whole world, is encompassed by love. But deeper still than the urge towards unity, and deeper still than the consciousness of unity, is unity itself, the unrevealed, which is the very substance of everything we know."

¹ Gids, November 1st, 1925.

Our need for marriage is not only based on the desire to satisfy the combined gregarious and sexual impulses. The desire for security also contributes much to this need. Above all for security of possession of the loved one, and also the feeling of security, of sure safety given us by the marriage unity, of which hearth and home are the symbols.

There is no need to analyse this feeling, but must I point out that the security which marriage offers, although it is really of great importance for the man, is infinitely more important, both objectively and subjectively, for the woman. As proof of this, I only need to remind my readers of the natural results of sexual union and all the feelings which go with it.

The woman has not only a greater interest in marriage, but, in general, she has more talent for it. Her particular feminine qualities—especially her tact, which is connected with the stronger secondary cerebral function, her natural wisdom, her concentration on others, her maternal feelings, her capacity to adapt herself, her inclination to be dependent—make her more suitable for marriage than the man with his typical aggressiveness, his egocentricity and his interest in things outside the home.

More interest in marriage and more talent for marriage means, to a certain extent and to a certain degree also, more responsibility for the happiness of the marriage.

To a certain extent and in a certain degree!—for it is obvious that the man cannot simply do and leave undone things that are inconsistent with marriage, without its having an effect on its happiness—it is no less true that the man, in many cases, when the woman does not adequately fulfil her task, can save a great deal by increased effort, and he is, in fact, equally responsible if he does not employ or bring into play this compensating factor.

It must not be forgotten that I retract nothing of what I have said in "Ideal Marriage"; that it is the man who bears, to the greatest extent, the responsibility for the fate of the marriage as far as the erotic side is concerned, and

therefore for the foundations of married happiness ; also, to no slight extent, he is responsible for the future course of marriage.

But it may be said with these important limitations that the merit or the blame for the success or failure of the marriage must be considered as being in the province of the woman. To express this in an aphorism, one might say : *The fate of marriage depends, in the beginning, on the man and later, on the woman.* Or again : *the man is responsible for the sub-structure of marriage and the woman is responsible for the superstructure.*

I have explained in "Ideal Marriage" that only too often the man does not feel this responsibility, and fails to fulfil, partly or wholly, the duties which arise from the erotic point of view in connection with his wife.

This deficiency in the man may be removed by following a course which demands no real sacrifice from him. On the contrary—apart from the insight which he can now achieve without too great effort—it demands nothing more than self-control, than thought, first and foremost, for his wife, which finally heightens and enriches his own sexual enjoyment and his erotic pleasures. I have no doubt that the man who *knows* and understands will fulfil his duties in accordance with the claims made upon him.

Does the woman understand or at least feel *her* responsibility and her duties, and fulfil them in a more or less correct manner ?

As far as many women are concerned, this question can, fortunately, still be answered with a more or less definite, and indeed often with a cordial "Yes." And Schiller's poem : "Honour the Woman" and all that is contained in it, has, for this section of the "weaker" sex, more than an historical importance.

But I have no doubt, and I regret to have to say it, that, in the last few years, a disturbingly large number of women, and this is growing rapidly, have lost that feeling of responsibility, and, indeed, practically all ideas in this

respect, and the fulfilment of the task of building up the marriage is kept no longer in view.

Had I doubted this, an impossibility for anyone who is not blind, I would have learned how matters stand from the letters which I received after the publication of "Ideal Marriage" from men of all kinds and of various ages.

These letters are particularly instructive. Those I have received from women, and they were many, although the book was not really written for women, were, without exception and without reservation, in agreement with the tendency of the book. Many thanked me "in the name of women" for having candidly stated how many of them fail to get their due in marriage because they remain sexually unsatisfied.

On the other hand, the letters from men almost all begin by admitting frankly that I have pointed out a very common fault in the behaviour of husbands towards their wives, but they are all unanimously of the opinion that in my book "the Woman comes off far too well."

I will not defend myself here against the sometimes concealed, sometimes open reproach contained in these letters, that I have been biased in favour of the woman, for those who have written the letters have not taken into consideration that I intended to deal only with *one* side of the problem in that book. Such a defence would only interrupt my present explanations and would lead us no further.

Nevertheless, I have considered it of importance to cite the points of view of these men, because it may help many women who read *this* book to achieve an insight into the manner of thought of the opposite sex, which is so important for the building up of married happiness.

As an instance, I quote the following letter. It is a typical example of the manner of thinking we have mentioned, and was written by a highly intelligent engineer of about fifty years of age, who is one of my friends. He is the director of a large factory, is happily married and an excellent father to his nearly grown-up children. He is of an observant nature and has seen much of the world.

“ The woman comes off too well in your book. I am sure that the man commits many faults in marriage, that he is a very unskilful lover, thinks too much about himself and, in addition to this, knows too little about the body and mind of his wife. That he behaves himself, so to speak, to some extent stupidly and awkwardly. But, on the other hand, my impression is that most marriages in fairly well-off circles are held together chiefly by the man. The woman is absorbed by her household duties, by her pleasures, by her frivolities, by her ridiculous worship of her children, and in immeasurable superficiality which is expressed chiefly in the whole fuss made about clothes. Most women have no conception of the real moral meaning of marriage and of the family. They consider marriage as a sphere in which they can, as far as possible undisturbed, live for their childish and often trivial pleasures. At the same time, the man must be looked after materially. His sexual demands must be tolerated,¹ but he is and remains a burden, an appendage. I had hoped, therefore, that you would have said a few strong words in your book to women, and pointed out to them how they can help to make a really ideal marriage possible. If the woman is only considered as a beloved being, she will lose much importance in time ; she must be a real comrade throughout life, and help her husband forward by increasing his self-respect and making him feel what he is capable of. Most women, on the contrary, depreciate their husbands, and put themselves at the head of the family as unsuccessful regents. I remarked once : ‘ The man sees his happiness in his profession. The woman her profession in happiness.’ Life is not a continuation of happiness, it is rather an incalculable mixture of good and bad cards, just as in bridge. It all depends on playing the game well, in spite of this. And if you are dealt a number of bad cards, not to lose one’s temper. The woman, however, only wants to have the trumps in her hand, and is angry with fate and with her husband if sometimes she is dealt a bad hand.”

One sees that this man, one of many, who has no reasons

¹ A qui la faute ? !

to complain, has no admiration for the type of woman that he usually comes in contact with in his circle of acquaintances.

In writing this letter, he does not mention another type that is met with more and more in increasingly wide circles, a type that I, by chance while writing these words, find typified in a woman who is certainly not old-fashioned. The modern woman who enjoys herself outside her own home, who is spoilt and thinks of nothing but dancing, who has short hair¹ and short skirts, painted cheeks, lips and eyebrows, who understands how to steer a motor-car, but not how to guide her children, who flirts with a mass of adoring men, but does not understand how to attract her own husband, who pours out tea at bazaars, has all sorts of little hobbies and understands how to adapt herself to anything except to her household duties.² We all know that this type is by no means the worst.

It is more than probable that the faults which the woman makes in constructing marriage are far more difficult to avoid than those that the man has to overcome in laying the foundations, because the woman has to make far more genuine sacrifices than the man. In many cases, and on this account, the man has not only to take on his shoulders that portion which naturally falls to him of construction and maintenance of the edifice of marriage, but must take upon himself, in addition to this, part of the tasks which should be by rights performed by the woman.

¹ I do not wish to be too hard on short hair ! Women whose growth of hair is only slight will find that this is a good way out of the difficulty. It is also excellent as far as hygiene is concerned.

² *Emmy Belinfante* in "De Groene Amsterdammer," Amsterdam, No. 2585.

CHAPTER X

THE CHOICE OF A PARTNER

PART ONE

Love and Common Sense

WE have seen how hard it is to make marriage happy, and how particularly difficult it is to maintain this happiness. More correctly, we have seen for what reasons married happiness offers so little resistance, and how often it must give place to married hostility.

We also know that these causes are, to a large extent, characteristic, and although they may be combated (and combated with success), they cannot be avoided ; but that they may really be avoided in another, equally important, respect if they are of an accidental nature.

It is obvious that the prevention of married hostility should be begun by avoiding those difficulties which can be circumvented, not only theoretically, as in our investigations, but, above all, in practical life.

This has been done, generally, by those people who have had experience of life, and have reflected on these experiences. In other words, all older people, and parents all over the world, in that they have not left it to the younger generation, who are inexperienced, to choose their partners in marriage, but, after mature consideration have made the choice themselves. For they knew that the prospects of success in marriage are greater, the better the partners are matched in external circumstances and in inner constitution.

Unfortunately, it is much more easy to judge the circumstances than the constitution, and this has led, combined with the danger (by no means always theoretical) that in marriages arranged by parents, the parental interests were the chief consideration, to the neglect of the primary factor, the temperament.

There has been an inevitable reaction to this. The young people of the last generation have freed themselves, more and more, from the guardianship of their parents with regard to marriage, so that now, generally speaking, parents receive only the information which their children give them about their marriage plans.

If we consider these matters from a broader point of view, it is obviously not wholly a reaction against the misuse of parental authority regarding the marriage of their children. Even if it occurred in some cases; if in other cases, the younger generation suffered in this respect from parental strictness and severity, which was not abused, but was well meant and was often of great value; if far more often they *believed* that they suffered from parental severity and that their parents were wrong in their attitude in preventing their children from consummating a true or imagined love, the trouble that parents have taken with regard to the choice in marriage has resulted in far more good than evil. Quite a number of modern men and women have regretfully had to admit to themselves, during the course of their marriage, that the victory they gained once over their parents' opposition has led to their own unhappiness.

On the contrary, the opposition of the last generation to the interference of parents in regard to the choice in marriage, is no isolated phenomenon. It is, just as the opposition to advice in regard to the choice of profession, only a part of the complex of phenomena that have developed in that period. If these phenomena are manifested in the manner above mentioned, or if they are expressed in the opposition of women to the leadership, guardianship and domination of men, or in the revolt of Demos against aristocratic rule, or of the resistance of the east to the interference of the west—they are all based on the same urgent desire for emancipation, to come of age; on opposition to coercion; they are a symbol of one and the same insubordination against authority. In short, they are a part of the surge towards "freedom" which has drawn all classes of human

beings with it, sometimes to their advantage, but no less often to their disadvantage. It is certain that this wave has, in many respects, not yet reached its zenith, but in other directions it is already beginning to subside. That its crest will be followed by a depression, cannot be doubted. We can believe this, because we know that every occurrence follows a rhythmic course of tension and relaxation of tension, and we can perceive that the turn of the tide has already begun. Only a little insight into the personality of human beings is necessary to understand that something is being demanded here, that by far the greater majority do not desire, that they only imagine they desire, and from which, in reality, they shrink—*independence*. For the great majority of human beings certainly know what they do *not* want, but they do not really know what they *truly* want. They will take no instructions and believe they can do everything very well themselves, as long as it is a question only of criticism and not of action. They endeavour to free themselves from an existing restraint and submit (to this end), as soon as the time for action arrives, to another, apparently chosen by themselves, but which is often much more oppressive.

For independence and self-determination, about which so much is spoken, and which is claimed to be so desirable, are only suitable for certain dominant natures possessing vital instincts. Most people, in truth, would far rather obey than command; far rather be led than lead. For, it is far more difficult to lead than to be led. It requires effort and power, whereas the man who allows himself to be led is only following the line of least resistance.

To develop this particular line of thought, regarding the political problems to which I have referred, would not be in consonance with the purpose of this book. I only make this reference because it is interesting to consider particular phenomena occurring in the world in general.

As far as the relationship between man and woman is concerned, *Gina Lombroso* has explained these problems fascinatingly and convincingly in her book, "*La Femme aux prises avec la Vie*."

In regard to the tendency of youth to let themselves be guided in the choice of a life partner by their parents, I am by no means certain that the depression in the wave will ever come again. The fact is that the cases here dealt with are usually of a more acute character ; the powerful nature of the emotional shock if a collision should occur between parents and children ; that young people, more than older people, demand to be allowed to make their own way, and the special circumstances of the situation where a person is convinced that he has acted in the wrong manner in going his own way and in scorning the advice of his parents, and cannot retrace his steps. These are the reasons, after the parental authority has been once definitely undermined in this respect, that it is not probable that this authority will be restored again within a comparatively short time.

There is, therefore, all the more reason to impress, most seriously, on young people and, indeed, on those no longer so young, who are thinking of marrying, that it would be advantageous to consider seriously the advice of those who have experience and knowledge and, indeed, to ask for it, whether the advisers are the parents or older people, who have a more mature outlook regarding these matters and who look upon it as their duty to give the advice asked of them in an objective manner.

All the more reason for giving the parents *that* knowledge they need, in addition to their experience in life, in order to enable them to give the *right* advice.

Last, but not least, to make the young people themselves understand what is at stake ; not to allow them to continue in their opinion that their young budding love, their sacred feelings and resolutions are sufficient guarantee for permanent happiness in marriage.

Do I, therefore, depreciate love, which I have mentioned for the first time in this connection, and believe it to be of little importance in concluding a marriage ?

Far from it !—not only because I am, myself, an idealist and will remain one ; not only because I believe that human beings should keep their ideals for the sake of their own, as

well as for others' happiness ; but also because the intuition which, during the process of sytematization of the still undifferentiated love feelings, directs and concentrates the feelings in a particular person of the other sex, may contribute much, to the right choice being made, from a certain point of view.

I say *may* contribute, to the right choice being made, *from a certain point of view*.

As far as this *may* is concerned, it must be emphasized that the "intuitive love choice" is often no more than illusion, and is dominated, in reality, not by intuition, but by chance (sometimes, indeed, to a chance "which has purposely been brought about"). In such a case, there is no question of *choice* and far less of an intuitively correct choice—which can always be stated if a man or a girl, during a period of particular receptivity for erotic impressions, merely meets a person of the opposite sex upon whom the individual's sexual needs can be concentrated.

In regard to the "from a certain point of view" in which intuition guides the feelings of love, I think the following remarks must be made.

Naturally, two people, who are in love with each other believe that their choice is based on individual motives and will lead to their personal happiness. This belief, indeed this absolute conviction, is an illusion which, according to *Schopenhauer*, is based on a trick of nature.¹ For nature alone can delude the man and woman who are in love with each other, that *their* welfare, *their* desires and *their* happiness will be served by this, while Nature herself really only works in the interests of propagation, in that she allows the choice in love to occur between these two people.

As it is not those individuals who are personally suited to each other who exercise mutual erotic attractive power on each other, but those whose qualities, in regard to propagation, compensate each other ; that is to say, in regard to the possibility of the birth of a useful offspring for the race ; so, nature, who serves the interests of the species at the cost

¹ "The Metaphysics of Sexual Love."

of the individual and his happiness, must make this individual believe that he is following his own interests in his love choice. But here, too, illusion is short and repentance long.

This is, roughly, the bitter and sardonic line of thought of the author of "The World as Will and Idea." Doubtless, the pessimistic attitude of mind of the philosopher was responsible for this line of thought in him. For, not only in art, but also in science (not to speak of philosophy), nature is perceived from the point of view of a particular type of mind. Nevertheless, if we cannot agree with *Schopenhauer* in his melancholy deductions, we cannot deny that he has, with great penetration, defined Nature's purpose in making the instinctive actions of individuals primarily useful for propagation.

Experience in daily life gives proof of this theory.

The impressions gained from the observations of life by casual observers which permit of various applications, are not so valuable as the results attained by an investigation made by *Kretschmer* on physical and mental agreement in marriage, in a hundred married couples, well known to him (to whom were added later seventy couples of another group).¹ This investigation showed that in nearly 60 per cent. of the cases the married couples were unequal partners, and, in over 15 per cent. the partners were, more or less, similar to each other; while, in the remainder of the cases, no decision could be reached with regard to similarity or dissimilarity. In the majority of marriages, opposites have sought each other: indeed, as was proved by close observation, the more striking the difference in temperament, the greater the inclination to go to extremes. Marriage between people of similar natures, on the other hand, was found chiefly in the middle-aged and in those who married

¹ The first investigation appeared in November, 1925, in *Kretschmer's* essay in *Keyserling's*, "Book of Marriage," and also in the *Review of Human Knowledge*. *Kretschmer* gives an account of 170 couples in the *German Medical Weekly*, 52nd year, Vol. 1, 1926. A similar series of observations on 100 married couples led *Herbert Gerstner* to similar conclusions (*vide* his short essay, "Character Study and Prognosis of Marriage," Vol. 2 of the "Year Book for Character Study," edited and published by M. von Kreusch, Berlin, 1926).

later in life. The author sees, in the attraction of the opposites shown by this investigation, the effect of the marvellous regulation of the instincts of broader natural principles going beyond the personal, which can by no means be entirely explained from the point of view of the psychology of the individual, and stand, indeed, partly in direct contradiction to what might have been expected—but which are of inestimable advantage for the welfare of mankind in preventing too great an increase in the biological variations inclining towards the extreme, and to restore to future generations the healthy mean suitable to the ordinary conditions of life.

What have been the results, regarding personal happiness of the married couple from this selection in marriage promoted in the interests of the children? Research makes no comment, at least concretely, and for obvious reasons. The author confines himself, apart from certain individual cases which he deals with more definitely, to expressing his conviction that, in general, those combinations which are most useful for propagation must often be regarded as favourable for the individuals. That, for instance, the instinctive attraction of opposites not only leads to a favourable mixture in the qualities of the children, but also to expansion of the mutual qualities of the married couple, which are often most valuable in the struggle for existence.

This mutual expansion gives, as *Kretschmer* remarks, a permanent feeling of relative happiness as the broad basis of the personal life together, while the irritation and repulsion which arise, owing to the dissimilarity of qualities, are more apt to be relieved in stormy scenes arising from time to time.

In *Schopenhauer* the pessimist speaks, but *Kretschmer's* opinions are definitely optimistic. He regards these matters from his own point of view, and no one who has read the lines quoted above will be surprised to find the author to be the prototype of the pycnic syntonic (that is to say, short, broad-shouldered equable) man gregarious and good-

natured, friendly and, at the same time, intelligent and quick-witted, as he is described by *van der Horst*¹).

But *Kretschmer* produces just as few proofs for his opinion of the measure of personal happiness resulting from the marriage of opposites as *Schopenhauer* for his contentions. The reader who has not the good fortune to belong to the type of man just described in the words of *van der Horst* must, to some extent, fail to credit the relatively rare appearance of those marriage storms induced by irritation and repulsion, at any rate if he uses his eyes and ears. For, not really does he see that the storms are numerous and violent, but he hears, in the pauses between the storms, almost uninterruptedly, the far-off roll of thunder, and feels that the atmosphere is charged with electricity.

I believe that the condition of affairs may be stated as follows, leaving aside all questions of temperament, as far as this is possible.

In the intuitive love choice, that is to say, in young love, in its purest, by which I mean its most primitive form, in so far as this choice is not determined by mere chance—under the guise of personal motives forces beyond the personal, are at work, the purpose of which is rather the welfare of the species than the happiness of a single individual. If this lovers' choice is consummated in marriage these forces make themselves felt even if intuition is thoroughly tested by reason. It is quite probable, however, that the difficulties which may arise, owing to this selection for the individual in consequence of the fact, that the species chooses and not he himself, will be minimised by the test (if the consequences are not shrunk from).

The purely intuitive choice in marriage may have advantages as well as disadvantages for the individual, particularly if the subconscious personal motive counter-balances the unconscious impersonal motives, or better, if they both work together for personal happiness.

Reasonable reflection in choice can be of great benefit

¹ *Van der Horst*, "Constitutional Types in the Healthy and Diseased." Groningen, 1924.

for the offspring and the species. To understand this, one need only think of the exclusion of inherited diseases in propagation.

The disadvantages that are connected with the purely intuitive choice in marriage really do not, necessarily, lead to *insurmountable* difficulties in marriage and thus to inevitable hostility. The difficulties can be conquered by determined effort on the part of the married pair, whereby the disadvantage of the pure love choice involves the necessity for the lovers, who have become husband and wife, to make a bigger effort to keep their love and happiness in the marriage.

If I desired to formulate as simply as possible the extremely complicated processes here at work which, in part, cannot even be visualised, it would have to be done as follows : love and understanding are necessary to maintain happiness in marriage ; reason that was too greatly neglected when the marriage was contracted must be repaid with huge interest during the marriage.

It is extremely difficult, indeed, it necessitates, sometimes, an effort which seems to be beyond most people, to allow reason to speak during the emotional period caused by a strong and passionate love. But much more effort is necessary to make good, during the marriage, what reason has neglected to do before the marriage, because it is no longer a question of coming to an heroic decision once and for all, but of a task lasting for years, which must be continued, almost uninterruptedly, with effort, self-control and self-sacrifice. He who allows himself to be carried away too quickly by the mirage of happiness in the stream of love, runs a great risk of having to battle all the harder for his married happiness, indeed for his peace and joy in life. He, on the other hand, who understands in due time, how to curb his intuitive feelings, may not, to the same extent, experience those raptures of love, but he greatly improves his chances of permanent happiness, which will not cost him all too great an effort. There is no need for him to sacrifice the joys of passionate love, and, what is more, there is

no need for those pleasures to be inferior to the ecstasies of entirely uncontrolled intuitive love. If love is often considered blind, he may also prove to be an "enfant de bohème." Although he has a particular preference for escaping all laws he can be guided and led if he has not been allowed to proceed uncontrolled *too* far in a particular direction.

Once he has been initiated into the way of practical sexual life, with insight and foresight (that is, according to my opinion, during the first months of marriage) the god of Love, who is somewhat shy at the beginning, develops, under such conditions, the full strength of love and brings happiness to the married pair.

And also the later married love need not be less complete in any way, if the primary cerebral function has controlled the secondary, when the marriage was contracted. To a certain extent the opposite is the case.

"More than is believed, love is often a fruit of marriage" ¹ or, to state it more generally, and in a more philosophical manner: it is clear that also, in marriage, indeed particularly in marriage: "The mind creates the situation." ²

¹ *Molière*, "Sganarelle," first Scene.

² *Keyserling*, "Creative Understanding."

CHAPTER XI

THE CHOICE OF A PARTNER

PART TWO

External Circumstances

WE will now consider what points should fairly be considered when reason begins to investigate the intuitive indications of awakening feelings of love for a certain person, as to whether it is desirable that these feelings should develop into a love choice and, later, into marriage.

The points to be considered are best divided into those dealing with external *circumstances*, with *health*, and with *disposition and character*.

We cannot devote very much space to the external circumstances.

There is no doubt that they can very greatly influence the happiness of the marriage. There is enough material regarding these matters to form a long, important and interesting examination, as has been shown by *Leopold Löwenfeld*, in his book: "Happiness in Marriage,"¹ which I recommended to readers in my first volume. I cannot, however, treat in detail of everything connected with this theme, because it would take up far more space than I have at my disposal. Apart from this, my readers will find, if they wish, interesting ideas about these questions in numerous books of varying intellectual merit, most of which can be thought out alone. No psychological training is necessary for this, only sound common sense. If they possess this, my readers can see quite easily for themselves what circumstances would be favourable for the happiness of a proposed marriage, and which would have the opposite effect.

¹ Fourth edition (J. F. Bergmann, Munich, 1919).

But sound common sense is far too often left out of account in marriage selection, not only when "the sweet madness" has been allowed to go too far, but often in cases where there is no question of a love emotion, when common sense could really make itself felt.

It is a very strange fact that people—I refer here, particularly to men, to men of various types (women usually follow emotional impulses rather than those of reason, by which I certainly do not mean that their emotional impulses are always love impulses, in selection in marriage)—that men, therefore, who are accustomed, in their business and in their work only to come to decisions after mature consideration and to act accordingly, as soon as the matter of choosing a wife arises, very often proceed to such a choice without any reflection whatsoever. Not because love forces them to do this, not because, intuitively, they serve the purposes of propagation in their choice, for, just in such cases, the selection very often is contrary to these interests; but simply because they do not reflect upon the importance of such a choice for their own future, and no less for their children. For it is the most important choice, indeed generally the most important act of their life, because the happiness or unhappiness of domestic life, which is dominated by the married relationships, is reflected in *everything*, even in the man's *work*! This cannot be too seriously impressed on the man who has still to make his choice in marriage. He must be convinced that he is making a mistake if he does not reflect deeply upon it, after having weighed up all the circumstances.

It should be stated, first and foremost, that, in regard to these factors, the fortune or financial prospects of the future wife or husband, are not the only matters for consideration.

Nevertheless, the financial conditions under which a marriage is contracted are of great importance for its future. The illusion of permanent "love in a cottage" has been proved to be an illusion, particularly in those cases in which the inhabitants of this cottage have been accustomed to

more comfortable surroundings. The passage in *Beethoven's* song, "I Love You"—"No day passed when you and I did not share our cares and troubles," awakens the best in everyone. But, if the listener has more than an elementary experience and ideas, he is well aware that, in spite of the following line, "Shared between you and me, they were easily borne," the daily returning troubles, if they are money worries, exert such a depressing influence on the whole life, that only very few marriages are equal to the strain. Certainly it is true that marriages are found in which the mutual struggle against constantly recurring adversity only strengthens and ennobles the love. The impression made by this can be so great and wonderful that it can also elevate the observer. But, far more often, we see husband and wife reproach each other regarding their money troubles; and it must be stated that these worries contribute, to a great degree, to the transformation of married happiness into the opposite, and to the origin of married hostility in its most hateful form.

Admitted that there are exceptions, but, generally speaking, love flies sooner or later from misery. And exaggerated idealism that blinds its disciples to the realities of life, leads only too often to unhappiness.

Is this now the proper place to examine how the financial relationship between the future married couple should be settled, so that it should have the least possible danger for married happiness, and promote this happiness as much as possible? I do not think so. What is necessary, must be left to the reader himself. Nevertheless, I shall take the opportunity of drawing attention to the following particular points which require special consideration:—

(1) The husband must not be financially dependent on his wife.

(2) The man must *earn* money.

(3) There should be no joint property.

(4) It is desirable that the woman should bring a certain amount of money with her.

(5) It is desirable that, not only the man, but the woman

too should have *unrestricted* control, according to circumstances, of a part of the income.

I am well aware that a number of other points may be added, particularly regarding the marriage property law. I also know that this question may be regarded from very different aspects, and that it may form the basis for endless discussion. But I am absolutely convinced that such discussion would not lead us much further. Therefore, I have only mentioned here what appear to me the most important points for preserving married happiness. Only the fourth point, I think, requires some explanation.

It is not essential that the fortune the woman brings with her should be large. But, naturally, here the idea of great and small is relative, and is dependent on the married couple's mode of life. But, even if the state of life to which the married couple are accustomed, may be called modest, it is, nevertheless, quite possible that the girl may bring a relatively large sum with her. That depends greatly on the customs, in particular countries or districts, and among certain groups of people. Quite by chance, I became acquainted, in Sicily, with a number of families belonging to the lower middle class: I met with the same conditions in all. The parents and brothers (!) worked hard so that the girls of the family should have a suitable dowry to take with them when they married.

It is well known that the dowry plays a most important part in France.

In my opinion, it is a pity that this system, which was in force almost everywhere at one time, is tending to disappear more and more, partly owing to financial strain. There is no doubt that the dowry is of great advantage for both of the partners, in various respects, for the organisation of marriage. The advantages, of course, will vary with the marriage.

I am convinced that the dowry will very seldom fail to have a favourable influence on the marriage. Naturally, on condition that it is not going to be spent immediately.

Very often the future wife can save enough to accumulate a small capital for the marriage. In such a case, I would

most strongly advise her to leave this sum untouched, if it is in any way possible.

On the other hand, I believe that a factor which has an unfavourable effect on the marriage is that the income of a large, or relatively large capital, brought by the woman on her marriage, should be employed for her personal use alone (some women are beginning to make propaganda for this as a principle of marriage). I also believe the arrangement to be wrong in which the man places his regular earnings, which are not particularly large (for example his salary), to the common fund, to pay the running expenses of the household, while he uses entirely for the satisfaction of his personal desires, the private income that he has or comes to him later, or which he earns by extra work. I have often seen such a state of affairs, which may lead to the man leading a far more luxurious life than his wife and children, and I have observed that this has obvious injurious results for the harmony of the marriage.

These indications should be sufficient to show the reader what financial measures I believe to be favourable and unfavourable for married life, particularly to show that material considerations in the married choice should by no means be neglected.

As far as the woman is concerned, it is quite natural that the following question must be put first and foremost: is the man in a position to keep, from the start, a small but, later, probably a large family, in the station to which they have been accustomed, and to provide for them in a fitting manner? What, however, is understood by "fitting" manner?

I think I am right in saying that we must consider "fitting" as a degree of comfort which enables the married couple to live *permanently* in a position not inferior to that to which they were accustomed before marriage, and to give their children at least as good an education as they themselves had.

A comment to this formula must be added to the effect that it is of no disadvantage, and indeed of advantage to

the marriage, in its early years, if it is begun on a relatively modest scale. Poverty is dangerous to married happiness, but too much money, particularly when the partners are still young, is equally dangerous. In addition to this, the ascending scale has a favourable effect in every respect. Again, it is unnecessary for the man's income to be high at the start. To have to calculate a little at the beginning is of no disadvantage if there are no real worries, and the position and capacity of the man guarantee an increase in the income in due time. In connection with this, it is by no means superfluous to point out that the education of the future married partners is of great importance. Parents who accustom their sons and daughters to too much luxury, make the burdens of marriage more onerous for the wife or husband of their children, and, indeed, in no small degree, for the child itself.

We cannot leave this theme without dealing with another problem—resulting from social conditions particularly as they have developed in recent years. Should it be considered advantageous or disadvantageous for married happiness for the married woman to carry on a profession, and is it desirable for the man to marry a woman who has learned a profession and can carry it on in practice ?

If we take the modern writers as a guide, the young men of to-day, owing to the struggle for existence which has become much more intense, have increasingly taken material conditions into consideration in regard to their choice in marriage, and, apart from this, make more claims than formerly, because the surplus of women over men has increased greatly. They show particular preference for women who have learned a profession and prefer the capital represented by this professional capacity to that in shares and other sources of income, the security of which, as has been shown by experience, is by no means greater than that provided by a profession.

As far as women who carry on a profession are concerned, these writers are of the opinion that they, accustomed to their own income, desiring luxury and expen-

sive holidays, a typical sign of the times, do not wish to sacrifice either the one or the other, so that they too wish to remain active in their chosen profession after marriage. In justice, these opinions must be compared with the statements of many women writers according to which most women do not desire to combine the activity they have exercised before their marriage with that of the wife or mother, which comes to them in marriage. Statistics taken from various professions show also that the majority of women, on marriage or a few years later, give up the profession they carried on previously.

This appears to me the best thing, at least as soon as children arrive, because it is impossible, apart from exceptional talent allied with specially good physical and mental health, to fulfil in a fitting manner, the extensive claims made by a profession together with the duties involved by marriage and motherhood. One of the two must suffer, and the woman, who takes her duties seriously, most of all.

The ways out of the dilemma, as to how the woman can permanently combine a profession practised to its full extent with marriage leaving the care of the children to others—or voluntary childlessness may occasionally appear to lead to the desired result. But this cannot be continued for long without injury to the woman and to marriage itself.

The injurious results which may, and usually do, follow if the care of the children is left to others, are obvious.

As far as the man is concerned, there is no doubt that he is adversely affected indirectly by the reaction of the circumstances we have here mentioned, and it is also obvious that, directly, he runs the risk of unpleasantnesses. For all these reasons, I can consider the attitude of "many young men" (are they really so many?) as right only when it is combined with the following essential limitations. The woman's profession should not make such great claims on her that she has no desire or time to give her *own* atmosphere to the home and household; her atmosphere which makes the house a real home for her and her husband, in which all domestic happiness is centred. Neither must the profession lead to the birth of the first child being too long

postponed. It must not prevent the woman from fulfilling completely her duties as a mother, which, of necessity, will be accompanied in many, if not in most cases by the giving up of the profession entirely, or in part. And, finally, a purely medical factor of very great and far-reaching importance, but one which does not make itself felt equally in all classes of society, the profession must not be the cause of physical injury, particularly regarding the normal process of the typical feminine physical functions.

With this limitation, but only with great emphasis on this limitation, the results of the carrying on of a profession, may be of advantage and indeed of great advantage, if the man chooses for his wife, a woman who is capable of these.¹

From this point of view, and also for many other reasons, it is a good thing if the girl has learned a profession.

And it may be of great advantage for the man, as well as for the woman, if she continues to carry on her profession in the first period of the marriage, if it is not too strenuous and does not take up her whole time. Not so much because of the financial advantages, although these must be considered, but, above all, as a remedy against a feeling of loneliness, which often is associated with boredom. This is very liable to happen, because the man must be at his work during the greater part of the day, leaving his wife to her own devices.

It is obvious that some professions are far more suitable to be carried on by a woman during her marriage than others. Indeed, certain professions cannot be combined with marriage without grave disadvantages. On the other

¹ The reader who wishes to know more about this great problem, dealing with the work and education of women in connection with her mental and physical qualities and her health, should read first and foremost *Max Hirsch's* admirable book, "Women as Students" (Kabitzsch, Leipzig, 1920), and the same author's monograph, "Women's Work and Women's Diseases," in *Halban and Seitz's* "Handbook of Feminine Biology and Pathology" (Urban & Schwarzenberg, Vienna, 1925), and also *W. Schweisheimer's* essay, "The Development of Women's Work in Germany and its Social and Hygienic Effects in Social Practice" (Gustav Fischer, Jena, 1920, Vol. 48, p. 1178). I also refer to my own work "E.T. oder E.U." ("Fit or Unfit for Marriage") Berlin 1930.

hand, others have no disadvantages whatsoever. And there are some that are excellent for the marriage relationships. Particularly those in which the married pair can work together, and, further, where it is possible to limit the activity, as the claims of marriage make this necessary. Examples of this are work on the land, small tradesmen who keep a little business of their own, and commerce generally. I have followed closely the careers of many such families, and have seen how the young wife has helped, how, through her effort, just as much as that of her husband, a small business has extended; how it was possible, when children came, grew up and required more and more the guidance of the mother herself, to limit the time she devoted to the business, while she herself, now with more help, continued to look after her department which usually included the whole and, later, a part, of the book-keeping and correspondence. I have seen such businesses run by the man and wife together, becoming more and more prosperous and some of them, in the course of a quarter of a century, becoming really large concerns, and my impression was that the partnership of the man and woman contributed greatly to this. Above all, however, my observations have shown most plainly the stimulating power which this association exercises on the married love as a whole.

In other professions, particularly in those where chiefly or entirely intellectual work is done, man and wife can work together provided that the limitations referred to above are taken into consideration. The woman's part may be either of an independent nature, or, what is commonly met with, she may act as assistant to her husband in his work. Here too, such partnership, even if it can only be carried out in a modest way, may be of great importance for the maintenance of married happiness, for it contributes, to no small extent, to give the woman an insight into the work of her husband and, therefore, a greater interest in it—an interest that is so important for a happy married life that I am inclined to think it an essential condition for permanent married happiness, although I admit that, as always, there are exceptions.

In addition, it is just on this intellectual plane that the partnership between a wife and husband, particularly if the natural relationship between the sexes is maintained the same in every respect, is associated with a psycho-erotic reciprocal effect of a very special nature, and the "Eros of work" (which I heard *Ludwig Klages* call this reciprocal relationship), may not only arouse love, but may also, and to no small extent, contribute to the preservation of love.

For all this, a girl has usually no need to have a training in a particular profession. But it is of particularly great importance for her to know as thoroughly as possible all departments associated with brain work. All the more because these special subjects can be of great use to her, even though her life is not centred in a profession. If a girl really knows languages, is a good stenographer and typist, has some experience in the establishment and keeping of file indexing; knows how to index a library and to keep it in order, and, in addition, knows something about the basis of book-keeping, she will find these things of great use to her in almost all circumstances whether she becomes later the wife of the proprietor of a small garage, or of a Minister for Foreign Affairs; of a business man or a scientist; if she must make her own way unmarried or must seek for work again, if she has been left a widow without sufficient means. It is just the same if she seeks a post as a shop assistant, or if she finds a position as secretary in an Ambassador's office; if she keeps the books of an employer of labour, or looks after her own capital; or if she does copying work or takes verbatim reports for her own amusement of lectures which she goes to hear; if she helps her husband or instructs her children.

The advantage of these qualifications will be so great for the man as well, that it is highly desirable for him to take them into consideration in making a reasoned choice in marriage. Such general knowledge and talents are, together with a general development in harmony with her position, personal qualities and inclinations, of far more use to the girl who sees her future in marriage, and also for the man who

marries her, than a specialised professional training. I can quite well imagine that the man who reflects well is bound to consider his wife's capability and love for a particular profession, that requires all her attention and powers, dangerous to marriage. For the woman herself, various disadvantages may be associated with this.

Thus, the knowledge or practice of a strenuous intellectual and specialised profession by the woman is not, as a rule, one of those circumstances that increases the prospect of permanent married happiness. Education in such professions must, in my opinion, only be given to such girls who show particular preference and aptitude for them and are firmly convinced that they will prefer to practise the profession they have chosen to being married. Such girls exist. I know more than one, although not very many who have carried it through; who have remained unmarried and are a blessing to themselves and others in the practice of their strenuous professional duties. It is quite understandable that these girls, whom we will rather call *women* because of their mental maturity, were no longer young when they came to this decision. A *young* girl seldom knows what she is doing when she chooses a difficult profession which cannot be, or only with difficulty, combined with marriage. Either she thinks that such combination is really possible, or imagines, because of a superficial knowledge "of life" that she is definitely not going to marry, or, as is usually the case, thinks little about it and chooses a profession in case she does not find a husband.

Naturally, it is not rational to begin a lengthy and difficult course of study without reflection. The results are obvious and can be seen every day. We have no need to deal with that side which deals with the Community—the State. On the other hand, the various influences which such a study, and all that is connected with it, have on the mentality, and the fact that such study usually takes away the typical feminine capabilities, cannot be ignored in their connection with the choice in marriage. The chief thing is that a young woman of this type should understand, if she contracts a marriage, that she is doing well to decide definitely to take

the other way and give up her profession. Half done is always an unfavourable prognosis, in this case also.

Exceptional cases there will be, in which the woman continues to carry on the same intellectual profession as her husband, but, nevertheless, there is a considerable risk that she, owing to her professional work, if this is carried out with the necessary seriousness will, in time, be hindered too much from carrying out her marital duties and special functions as a mother. This may have a very disadvantageous influence on married happiness. The usual way out, in order to avoid the threatening conflict between duties and interests, which arises from the combination of a profession and marriage, is to give up the professional activities gradually, as more time is occupied in the marriage duties ; but, in the cases we are considering here, this does not lead to a satisfactory conclusion, because the woman's interest in her profession, when she has remained true to it during her marriage, often proves to be too strong for her to give it up *partially*.

The almost heroic decision, in these circumstances, to sacrifice an activity which has become more and more dear, can cause a mental trauma which may be far from unimportant as far as married happiness is concerned. But if this decision is not taken, very often really morbid disturbances arise as a result of the generally fruitless attempts to meet the great demand made by professional and marriage duties, and to continue to perform both equally well. Disguised resignation in a form of "an escape in illness" is by no means rare in such cases. It is less common than simple renunciation of further efforts to preserve married harmony ; and, as a result of this renunciation, the appearance or non-appearance in actual fact, of permanent hostility.

No *solution* of the conflict will be reached in any of these cases. On the contrary, the conflict is indeed victorious.

The only possible *way out* for such marriages is the conversion of the *marriage relationships* into a relationship as asexual as possible, into a more or less friendly neutral relationship, with suppression, sublimation or diversion in another direction (which means, in practice, interest in

another person) of all feelings and desires that stand in the way of such a conversion. This is indeed the way out which may be observed in such cases that have turned out comparatively well ; and is also observable, sooner or later, in those married couples where the woman carries on a strenuous intellectual profession which is *not* the same as that of her husband.

No one will, however, maintain that a marriage which turns out relatively well in such a way is desirable. The diversion of the erotic feelings towards a third person may indeed, when the fixation of these feelings is the result, give new purpose, to a certain extent, to the life of the individual, but it leads, least of all, to the salvation of the marriage.

While I most emphatically agree with the view that here, just as everywhere else in judging the state of affairs, the individual case must be taken into account (and indeed in a double respect, that is to say in regard to the personality both of the observer and the observed), and admit that there may be exceptions, I think it necessary to repeat the following deductions reached from my statements :—

that the study of a special intellectual profession making many claims on the woman is, generally speaking, not to be recommended as a desirable preparation for marriage ;

that, on the contrary, an efficient general training, in the sense above mentioned, may be considered a favourable factor ;

and that limited exercise, in the way we have described, of such a “ general ” profession by a married woman, particularly if this be carried on in association with the man, or is of help to him in his work, may be considered in many cases and in respect of the most varied professions, as quite possible, in many ways, desirable, and usually as promoting married happiness.

I am convinced that men will be acting with sound common sense if, in their marriage choice, they take into

account the material and psychological advantages of the dowry represented by a knowledge based on thorough training in those subjects which may be turned to account both in married life and elsewhere.

Naturally, such a dowry only possesses its full value if these capabilities are found in combination with a type of mind ready and willing to put them to use, even if necessity does not make work essential. For, what is the use of capabilities and knowledge, if there is no desire to put them to practical use?—if there is no pleasure in work for work's sake, independent of any coercion, no love of work and the pleasure it brings?

But the education of girls in this general knowledge leaves much to be desired, generally even when they have gone through special schooling in this respect. Almost always, they have not the faculty of being able to work rationally however many examinations they may have passed. Particularly they need a colloquial and, at the same time, a thorough knowledge of modern languages.

Fundamental improvement in education in the direction mentioned above, will increase the prospects of a girl's married happiness, and of her being able to obtain work, if she does not marry, far more than the recent throwing open to women of various professions and branches of study.

Another improvement in the education of the modern girl, which is absolutely essential to her marriage prospects, must be training in what, if I remember rightly, is quaintly termed the "practical science of marriage."

If such a designation can contribute to forwarding our purpose, we may most certainly admit it, inasmuch as in teaching, practical knowledge (that is, first and foremost, not knowledge, but the capability of applying that knowledge), is placed above, and indeed far above the "science." The capacity to run a house in a practical way among a great proportion of the girls of our time leaves a great deal to be desired, and is still lacking, even when they have gone through a course of training, as is frankly admitted by the excellent instructresses of such courses. How can it be

otherwise, when this knowledge is invariably put to practical use only for a relatively short time, and is not extended and increased by constant practice in systematic household work (which really leaves the girl enough time for other occupations and for pleasure)! We will not attempt to analyse the numerous causes that have led to deficiency and incapability for the profession of wife and mother among so many women and girls. The phenomenon *exists*. It forms only part of a series of phenomena which have been brought about by the "crisis of marriage," accompany and follow it (which has been observed on all sides and not without apprehension). This phenomenon is of particular significance because it can, of itself, contribute, in no small degree, to the accentuation of the difficulties which arise in marriage.

Numerous women are equally convinced of the prevalence of their sisters' lack of talent, and of the important effect this deficiency has on married happiness, the welfare of the children, the prosperity of the family, and the good of society. And consequently they have for many years given practical proofs of this conviction in the establishment of cookery schools and domestic training schools. Later, in co-operation with doctors, they have started schools for mothers, courses in the care of children, and other measures of this nature. For example, such women in Switzerland, have for a long time urged that domestic economy should be an obligatory part of girls' education, and again and again have pressed this matter vigorously.¹ They have carried on very active propaganda in Holland too, but particularly in Germany and Switzerland, for the establishment of "a woman's year of service" in which, it is true, other purposes are also intended, but one of the motives of which is to remove that evil. To conclude with one of the most interesting phenomena in this domain, a high school was established in Boston some time ago, where girls were to receive a three-year course of instruction, after which they became "certificated brides" (with C.B. on their visiting cards!). If, as it appears from information that I have received with regard to the curriculum, the main points

¹ *Neue Züricher Zeitung*, No. 129, 1927.

lie in psychological instruction, the practical common sense of the American people, warrants the assumption that the practical side of household work will not be neglected by the pupils.

However advantageous and important all experiments of such a nature may be, they cannot really lead to the desired result, if they only succeed in achieving skill without a genuine love of domesticity.

The results are just the same in regard to this professional skill with those we have spoken about previously.

If it is not combined with the real desire to employ it methodically, it is not of very much value except in times of stress. For this reason, the man who has common sense enough to take into account the possessor of domestic talent in his choice of marriage, will pay no less attention to the love of domesticity than to the knowledge of running a household. Both of these qualities guarantee that the marriage will have at least one rock less to circumnavigate.

Fortunately, there are, in reality, more girls and women who can do this than might be believed superficially, but usually they are not *those* who are most apparent to the eye.

The question of the man's profession on whom the choice of the woman may fall is of equally great importance, and it is short-sighted (and may be dearly paid for later) if little thought is given to this matter. Whether the man to whom she is married has a peaceful profession or one that requires all his efforts and exhausts him ; if he is free, outside his fixed hours of work, or must be ready to stand by at any moment and never feels certain of having spare time ; whether his work keeps him in one place or if he is forced frequently to travel long distances far from home. But I need go no further. There are too many conditions of this nature to recount them all. Nevertheless they have often a deciding influence on the success or failure of the marriage. Therefore, let those who are going to pledge themselves to each other for life, consider whether the character of the woman, and the demands she makes on

life, can be harmonised with the claims made on the man by his profession. Some professions demand far greater sacrifices, not only from the man himself, but also from his wife, than others. For example, a doctor's wife.

Important as it is for the future wife to consider, in her marriage choice, the nature of the man's work, it is of far greater importance for her that he *does work*. I would advise every woman, if she desires to have a successful and happy marriage, not to marry a man who does nothing. A girl who thinks only superficially may perhaps imagine that it is an advantage to have a husband, who has no professional duties to perform, for herself alone. In reality, however, the contrary is the case. Sooner or later, they will become bored with each other, and boredom, which at first is felt when they are both together, but very soon by each separately, results in disastrous consequences for marriage, the first of which is estrangement. For it is not in a man's nature to play the part of "entertainer" to his wife. If he does, he often changes his "post."

The question, whether the man only exercises his profession owing to circumstances forcing him to do this, or if he puts his whole heart and soul into his work must also be considered in marriage selection, for the answer to this question shows, to an important degree, his *attitude to life*.

The following points must be considered in regard to this matter: an *essential* difference in the attitude towards life of the future married pair may be partial before marriage even if it makes itself evident in a more or less disturbing manner. Further, as long as the erotic emotion remains dominant in the marriage, that difference will not lead to a collision, because, under such conditions, it is not very difficult to suppress the outbreak of a conflict, by diverting the feelings and thoughts into another channel. But inevitably, there comes a time when the erotic emotion does not dominate to such an extent that it can invariably drive into the background and permanently repress the expression, of essential differences in the attitude to life. Then collisions are inevitable. Since we are speaking of *essential* differences

in the attitude to life, these collisions are also important. It is thus not possible to remove them by discussions and explanations and to reach true agreement ; and it is just as little possible to find a basis for a future attitude in which both parties can live together in harmony. The possibility of frequent repetitions exists, and there is no *need* for stormy scenes nor resentment (that depends on the character and the amount of self-control and also, to a large extent, on the upbringing) ; but in any case there is great probability of dissatisfaction remaining.

Even if the difference in the attitude towards life is, only rarely, the exclusive cause of the origin of married hostility, it can contribute in no small degree to this origin, and, in any case, it requires, in the course of time, so much effort, again and again to bridge over important differences of this nature, that it is far preferable to avoid the necessity of making the effort.

Disparity of *character* and *temperament* in husband and wife may, at least to a certain extent, be of advantage. A definite dissimilarity in the *attitude to life*, however, has only disadvantages, very often indeed serious disadvantages. Those who avoid this by a correct marriage choice are acting most reasonably.

One of the most important differences in the attitude adopted to life which may be dangerous to the harmony of marriage is seen in a person's standpoint to "work" and "pleasure." There is a point of view towards life which proceeds from the manner of thinking (more rightly from the feeling) that *work* together with, or indeed more than, love, makes life worth living. This is the attitude expressed in the aphorism "a man's work is his life." He does not despise "pleasure" ; indeed, he welcomes it as a diversion, as a change ; he takes it, according to his nature and his mood at the moment, but it is, and remains for him, a secondary consideration. His joy and interest in life, the chief activity of his brain lies in his work (apart from the predominance of erotic feelings from time to time) and in the pleasure that it gives him ; in the prospects of success

that it opens up for him ; in the obstacles that it places in his way, in the dangers it brings him ; in the worries it entails ; and even in the disappointments that it costs him. For these disappointments, difficulties and dangers are to him so many desired stimuli to redoubled and renewed effort, to the strengthening of his will " to carry it through " —not to be beaten ; to win the victory.

This point of view is opposed to the following conception (better, the manner of thinking) : we are in the world for our pleasure and we work only in so far as necessity drives us, or as much and so long as it pleases us, always ready to lay down our tools, even if the work is incomplete, as soon as the necessity of finishing it ceases or new desires occupy our mind and divert our thoughts : " for such is our good pleasure."

I am the last to maintain that this is the woman's point of view. Even if it is the ideal of many (or very many—who can tell ?) women. For I am firmly convinced that this even now is not the true nature of women, and I know only too well that there have been types of men in all ages who have lived according to the idea contained in the remark we have just quoted, which was made by a man.

What I believe I must make clear is the following : at the present time, when the " good pleasure " attitude to life is no longer the " privilege " of a relatively small group of people, but is found in many classes as the pattern of life for whole families, it can no longer remain out of consideration in regard to selection in marriage. A girl who is brought up in a family where such ideas are the rule, who has lived for some years in harmony with this attitude, who possesses and keeps up familiar and friendly relations in circles in which such and similar points of view are held to be the best, will feel that she has been disappointed and deceived if she marries a man who earns his living.

The " working man," however, who marries a girl having such entirely different ideas of life and conduct, may labour under the delusion that his love for her and the influence of

his ideas will change her. But he forgets that education, memories of childhood, habits and connections, form a second nature which, just as the innate qualities, always return again, even if fought, with drastic measures.¹ If he has, in the first period of marriage, endeavoured, to some extent, to adapt himself to her attitude to life, and, at the same time, has tried to win her over to his point of view, he will, within a comparatively short time, come to the conclusion that his marriage has been an unforgivable stupidity. For it is impossible to reach a sufficient agreement with regard to what he and she expect from life, and consequently to the way and methods according to which they desire to arrange their life.²

More often, and with greater emphasis than with regard to what we have just explained, it is pointed out in books on marriage, where religious convictions are being dealt with, that like to like is desirable, not to say essential. It is well known that religions, according to the strictness of their principles and regulations, prohibit "*mixed marriages*," or at least seriously dissuade people from contracting them. It is possible, and indeed probable, that the object of these regulations is to promote the interests of mankind as a whole. But it is quite certain that these interests are in complete agreement with those of individuals. In fact, if an attempt is made to avoid unhappy marriages by advice and to make the conditions in which a marriage is contracted as favourable as possible for permanent harmony, no other procedure is possible than seriously to dissuade people who belong to different religions from marrying each other, even if one does not regard the matter from the Church's point of view, not to speak of that of one of the "faithful." For the prospects of difficulties in the long years of marriage are great, in spite of all good will and promises honourably meant in the beginning. And even if the difficulties of this nature are overcome by love and compatibility, the claims made

¹ "*Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret*" (Horace, Epistles I. 10, 24).

² Cf. end of Chapter IV.

on the resisting capacity may in time be so great that it is impossible to fulfil them with the best of goodwill.

Obviously the problem has quite another aspect if the future married pair belong to religious faiths only in name, and on paper. It must not be forgotten, however, that the mind, during youth, may have become so strongly rooted in particular ideas and practices that the old ideas can easily regain their influence whenever mystic necessities arise during lifetime.

Those who try to protect men and women against their own short-sightedness in selection in marriage, must not forget to point out to them the dangers which threaten the married harmony when there is a *difference in class* between the married pair. All the more, since youthful idealism and the influence exercised on the personal manner of thought of many people, by the political ideas now dominant to equalise everyone, may only too easily be combined with the beginning of a love affair and suppress any misgivings about the marriage choice.

I have not the slightest desire to deny the *equal value* of all classes as far as their importance to society is concerned, but no one will maintain their *similarity*. Every class has its habits of life, its manners, its own taste in practically everything; its characteristic attitude to things and ideas of life in many respects. It is just the same as with *various nationalities*, not to speak of *racial differences*.

Here too equal worth, but dissimilarity—which, moreover, often makes those who belong to one type believe in the inferiority of the other—a dissimilarity which causes disharmony in many an international marriage and later indeed absolute estrangement between the married pair.¹

It would not be difficult for me to illustrate what I have just said by quoting a number of examples from my own practice. I have seen signs of married hostility in its most

¹ Unless the husband and wife belong to that relatively small group of people who lead a really international life; but even then—for an international life and international customs are not by any means identical with a real international mind; feelings, moments and circumstances, indeed periods of time may come when "blood is thicker than water."

typical form owing to characteristic differences in habits and ideas, between English and German, English and Dutch, Dutch and Swiss, Swiss and Italian, German and Dutch, not to speak of marriages between Italian and Dutch, Hungarian and Dutch and Roumanian and Swiss, for I only know a few such cases. They all belong to the group which must be considered as marriage failures, owing to the various national idiosyncrasies. I believe to be particularly instructive and, therefore, worthy of special mention, a number of observations I have made in connection with Dutch married couples, whose English tendencies and connections on the one hand, and German on the other, occasioned so much friction that love took to flight after a short time and left the field free for hostility.

Estrangement comes more rapidly and acutely when the couple are not equal in *class*. Naturally here, too, the difference can be bridged over by the capacity for adaptation. It is not very difficult for certain men and women, at least to a certain extent, to assimilate the way of life and manners of another class. But it is quite another matter, with the manner of feeling and thinking, and with the ideas in regard to various things in life. Memory proves itself, in far the greatest number of cases, to be dominant sooner or later. The tie is too great and the hostility which separates the classes from one another bursts forth with elemental force. It only needs a word at a particular moment to work like lightning. Indeed, it need be only half a word, a mere indication, but the ban is broken and the illusion destroyed, the *real* situation is laid bare. I leave the further development of the theme to the dramatist.

An essential difference in the attitude to life of the married pair is shown most strongly in the problem of the children's education. Even if the husband and wife succeed in conquering the considerable difficulties which must arise from the contrast in their ideas of life, and are able to avoid them with tact or with the help of the erotic emotions that bind them together, these differences can no longer be ignored when the question of children arises. How the children are

to be educated, with what purpose and according to what methods ; what ideas should be taught them ; what they should learn ; and what their future should be—how can the father and mother agree about this, when they think entirely differently about life, about what is owed to it, and what should be demanded of it ? It is obvious that, in such a case, the man is of the opinion that his wife always makes mistakes with regard to education ; and the woman thinks that the man acts on false premises. If the child follows the father, the mother does not care for it ; and when the child takes after the mother, the father wishes it were otherwise.

Thus, the presence of children, in these conditions, instead of strengthening the bond between the parents, divides them and leads to married hostility. The children themselves suffer to a great extent owing to the difference in their parents' attitude towards life, and thus, on account of their unconsidered and incorrect married choice. With regard to that choice, the result of our exposition can only be that also, as far as the children are concerned, like must mate with like !

An important point must finally be considered with regard to the marriage selection. One marries not only a man or a woman, but a *family* as well !

I see many of my readers shrug their shoulders when they read this. I know the "foolish dream" of young—and not only young!—people only too well, and I know that this dream deludes them into the belief that if they marry a member of a family they dislike, they need have nothing further to do with such relations, provided this is agreed upon at the start.

I must, therefore, answer this incredulous shrugging of the shoulders with an explanation to prove the correctness of my contention : this explanation can, however, only be short, and I must therefore confine myself to a few observations.

First, long experience teaches us that, here again at certain moments, "blood is thicker than water," and that it

can be predicted with almost mathematical certainty that such a moment will come and, in addition to this, it is just such an undesirable family that finds ways and means of making its existence clearly felt.

But this is not the main point. No person is like a sheet of white paper at the time of marriage and the time that has preceded marriage has, usually, been spent with the family. This is imprinted on the mind (indeed, *engraved*) and is indelible. It remains deep in the sub-conscious mind, and may rise to the surface at any moment. Further, there is the bond of heredity by which the individual is so closely connected with his family and relations! I can only enunciate this point, but it is enough to recall to the memory of those who have forgotten for a moment, that a living being in this respect does not exist *per se*, but is part of a whole, having its being in members of a family and its ancestors, a whole that, in short, may be termed "a complex of relations."

I recommend those of my readers who wish to possess, in addition to the insight, which I am endeavouring to give them with regard to marriage, a survey of heredity which is so closely connected in every respect with marriage, to read *J. Meisenheimer's* essay on the "Bases of the Theory of Heredity," in *Veit-Stöckel's* "Handbook of Gynæcology."¹ Those who wish to study the problem with which we are here dealing in greater detail, should read the third part of *Hermann Hoffmann's* book: "The Problem of Character Building."² Readers who have not already studied such matters, will find these books rather difficult, but they will find facts and ideas in them that will make it worth their while to read them. The comparative analysis of character of the members of the *Bonaparte* family and the "Race of *Pehr Pehrsson*" described by *H. Lundberg*,³ present particularly clear illustrations of what has just been said with regard to the individual in connection with his relations.

¹ Vol. 2 (J. F. Bergmann, Munich, 1926).

² J. Springer, Berlin, 1926.

³ "Medical, Biological, and Genealogical Research into a Peasant Family in Sweden, with 2,232 Descendants" (Gustav Fischer, Jena, 1913).

If my readers wish to study this in another, but no less convincing manner, the analysis (which was not written for this purpose) given by *Keyserling* in his book: "Men as Symbols,"¹ should be read.

To return to the more obvious importance of the family relations for the choice in marriage; it is clear that these relations can be at least as favourable as they are above shown to be unfavourable. In favourable cases, which, fortunately, are numerous enough, the family not only gains a son-in-law or a daughter-in-law by the marriage of one of its children, who may really become children of the house, but he or she, who is received into the family, gains a second parental home. This is reason enough to consider earnestly, in the choice in marriage, into what sort of a house he or she may be going and what manner of person is to be received into one's own house—into one's whole family.

¹ Otto Reichel, Darmstadt, 1926.

CHAPTER XII

THE CHOICE OF A PARTNER

PART THREE

Health

It would not surprise me, if a doctor writing on selection in marriage, were expected to devote considerable space to the importance of the health of the married couple as far as the success of their marriage is concerned.

Nevertheless, I shall not do this. On the contrary, I shall only devote a short chapter to this subject, even although I, no less than other physicians, believe that every husband should be fully convinced of the value of perfect health in his wife, and of his own duty to be himself in a similar state of health. But our purpose here is to consider selection in marriage exclusively with the object of preventing, as far as possible, married hostility. And even although there is no doubt that phthisis may seriously injure the happiness of a marriage in various ways, it would be going too far to say that tuberculosis was a predisposing cause of married hostility; unless it was discovered that a disease of this nature, or clear predisposition to it, had been purposely concealed.

This will avenge itself just in the same way as any misrepresentation regarding what the future husband or wife must, or should, expect from marriage, and involves dangers, indeed, great dangers for the harmony of the marriage.

A further reason for not examining in detail the importance of health for selection in marriage, is that the facts which are connected with this subject are so numerous, and there are so many obvious points that must be reflected upon, that

they would distract the attention of my readers more than I consider desirable from matters that I think to be paramount in this book.

Therefore, I shall confine myself to reminding my readers of the great importance of such facts and considerations which they may find described in other works,¹ and limit my survey to a few special points which are usually not sufficiently noticed and which, from experience, I hold to be particularly important.

First and foremost, I will refer to what I have already said in "Ideal Marriage," and in my essay, "A Medical Investigation on Physical Capacity for Marriage and Infantilism of the Feminine Sexual Organs."² I attempted there to show how desirable it was that future married couples should frankly inform each other of matters concerning health, and I pointed out how this could best be done in the least unpleasant manner.

I again emphasise the fact that marriage is really a sexual relationship, and as a consequence the possibility of its success depends primarily on the presence of normal sexual organs. The demands that the man and woman should and must make on their partner are the following:

I. The sexual organs must be :

(a) Free from diseases and anomalies ; and

(b) Capable of performing normal sexual relationships.

II. Sexual functions must lead to impregnation, and must allow an undisturbed pregnancy and birth.

III. The organs must not contain micro-organisms which might do damage to the man or woman if transmitted to them.

I need make no comments in regard to the first point. In regard to point II., it should be noted, as far as the man is concerned, that he must have enough vital spermatozoa

¹ Cf. my book : "Fit or Unfit for Marriage," Berlin, 1930.

² *Gynæcological Review*, 1926, No. 13.

in sufficient quantity. An examination to see if they are present must not be forgotten if the future husband has previously contracted epididymitis.

An undisturbed regular menstruation process may be considered as an important proof of a normal condition in the woman, although we find fertility with abnormal menstruation, and still more often sterility with normal menstruation.

Further, sterility, as a result of peritoneal adhesions in the lowest part of the abdominal cavity is of importance and, in my opinion, too little attention and, indeed, very often none at all, is paid to this. These adhesions may arise in young girls as a result of acute or chronic peritonitis. They are generally attributable to tuberculosis or gonorrheal infections, or to the spreading of inflammation from the appendix. This process may cause such adhesions more or less at any age, just as tubercular inflammation, but this appears more often in the years of childhood. Gonorrheal peritonitis among girls is, on the other hand, with a qualification which I shall mention later on, almost exclusively a phenomenon of the early or relatively early years of youth. This is because the mucous membrane of the sexual organs of a young child are extremely sensitive to such infection, and because the infection may comparatively easily reach the abdomen. Thus, the opportunity for contracting a gonorrheal infection in this period of life is great. It is usually transmitted by the mother (often owing to infection during birth) or from a sister or a servant. But infection may take place also during an epidemic in schools. The germs of the disease are usually transmitted from one child to another by towels, dirty hands and so on.

It is obvious that gonorrhea in children, as stated above, may have an influence on the marriage. To allay anxiety, I may add that I have seen many such infections in small children in which there were no signs of any extension, and many women, whom I treated in their youth for this disease, become pregnant. Nevertheless, what I have said may spur on parents to protect their daughters as far

as possible by increased attention and care from injury in this respect.

I mention with special emphasis, *infantilism* of the feminine sexual organs in connection with point II. mentioned above, although I have already dealt with it adequately in my previous writings. I do not do this merely because it appears right to me once more to emphasise and point out the particularly great importance this may have for the marriage prognosis (and should, therefore, have for the choice in marriage) in that if it is recognised in good time and is not present in too marked a degree, a definite improvement may be noted before marriage, but because I desire to draw attention to a little-known but interesting and important cause of this interruption in development. More cautiously expressed: I desire to throw light on a curious connection that I have observed time and again in association with this anomaly. This association—I will be still more cautious—this coincidence, that I have noticed on various occasions, is that of the infantilism of the internal sex organs of grown-up girls, arising from insufficiently treated syphilis contracted by the father previous to the marriage. I cannot explain this matter in detail, but will only describe certain special peculiarities. In certain instances, infantilism appeared in the womb, but in other cases, interrupted development of the ovaries was also noticed. Sometimes all the other parts of the body were well developed, while at others, symptoms of interrupted development might be observed in other organs, although a typical directly recognisable infantilism of the whole body and mentality was never present. Symptoms reminiscent of chlorosis were relatively common, and also a marked infantilism of the heart, particularly under X-ray examination. Symptoms of hereditary syphilis, as usually understood, were never found in these patients. In those cases in which I had the opportunity of performing the Wassermann test, the result was negative. Even when I was successful in improving infantilism of the uterus to such an extent that the organ became as large as was sufficient in similar

cases to permit of pregnancy, sterility was the result in every instance.

As far as my observations go, syphilitic symptoms had never been observed in the mothers of these patients.

The syphilitic infection of the fathers who belonged, without exception, to the higher classes of society, had taken place in every case some few years before marriage. They had been treated and had been declared cured. But these infections were contracted many years before diagnosis and treatment had reached the perfection of our days! In any event, I know, from confidential information I have received from physicians who treated them, that symptoms of disease appeared in more than one of those fathers in later years, which presumably were connected with the syphilitic infection.

What I have said is sufficient, as far as actual observations are concerned.

With regard to theory: Poisoning of the germs at once arises in the mind, but I would ask the reader to allow me not to insist on these questions.

The practical conclusion? It is so self-evident that there is no need to devote many words to it. One can only express one's pleasure at the great advance that has been made in the treatment of syphilis, and lay the greatest possible emphasis on the fact that no man should attempt to contract a marriage unless every possible means of diagnosis has been used, and it has been proved that he is so entirely cured of syphilis that, not only his wife but also his children, cannot, as far as is humanly possible, be injured by the results of this infection.

As far as point II. *b* of the schedule referred to is concerned, I have pointed out that *normal structure of the feminine pelvis* is one of the conditions that must not fail to be taken into account, having in mind the natural consequences of marriage, and it is, therefore, necessary to investigate in time the condition of this part of the body.

I refer my readers again to the fact that anomalies in the

formation of the pelvis may lead to serious disturbances in confinement, and are very often the result of rickets. This, I think, enables me to come to the following conclusion.

During the whole period of development, from the initial period onwards, the girl is exposed to the effects of injurious influences which may decrease her aptitude for marriage ; understanding and affectionate parents will take this factor into consideration as far as possible. *Physicians will also be well advised to keep in mind, in their observation and treatment of girls, more than has been the case up to the present, the demands which marriage will make upon them in the future.*

I consider that certain remarks should be made with regard to the last of the three conditions mentioned in the schedule above.

A person who makes it possible for a companion to contract an infection in sexual relationship, acts in a most irresponsible and, indeed, in a criminal manner. If this companion is the wife or husband it is, apart from this, extremely foolish, because they will themselves be the victims of the damage.

There will be few people who will not indorse both these contentions. In spite of this, there are a great number of cases, in which the man has infected his wife with gonococci (I pay particular attention to this infection, as we have already considered syphilis to a certain extent). The cause of this lies, in relatively few instances, in a lack of a feeling of responsibility, but far more often in ignorance ; ignorance regarding the very serious consequences which gonorrhea involves for the woman ; ignorance particularly in regard to the infectiousness of the *residuum* of gonorrhea.

This ignorance, resulting from the foolish idea of the slight importance of gonorrhea, which is only too often quite inadequately treated, because, practically always the disappearance of the obvious symptoms are taken as a sign that a cure has taken place, has existed first and foremost among patients. But a great number of doctors are also to

blame, as they pronounce their patients cured far too quickly, and do not keep them under observation, or do this to an inadequate extent.

All this has been greatly improved in the last few years owing to increased knowledge and more insight. It must, however, be stated and emphatically stated, that this improvement is by no means adequate.

We gynæcologists can adduce a number of cases in which a man, who thought himself to be entirely cured, or was told so, and by no means rarely by a doctor, nevertheless infected his wife. Gonococci are micro-organisms which perish very quickly outside the body, but are extraordinarily tenacious of life if they reach concealed parts, folds, small cavities and microscopical gland ducts of the male and female sexual organs. A gonorrheal infection is a serious illness as far as the prospects of injurious consequences are concerned, and must be treated with the greatest care by a specialist, both in men and women. After the disappearance of all symptoms, repeated observation is essential, with the employment of all the remedies placed at our disposal by bacteriology and serology. This examination must be repeated before a marriage is contracted, and must be made by one or more doctors who are competent in every respect.

A gonorrheal infection in marriage (I am not speaking now of the transmission of an infection to one of the partners of a disease contracted *during* the marriage) can be sufficient in itself to cause insurmountable antipathy, so that it is absolutely essential to consider the point most carefully at the time the marriage choice is made.

I must make a few observations with regard to the presence of gonococci in the sexual organs of future wives. They may be shortly expressed as follows: I can give no definite opinion with regard to the infectious residuum of gonorrhea in childhood. In my own experience, the disease does not reappear, practically speaking, in adults. Recently, I wrote to the effect that it seemed, in the course of years, (more markedly than with gonorrhea in adults), that the

germs were destroyed owing to self-immunisation of the body. On the other hand, *Ludwig Fraenkel* says, and I value very highly his experience and opinion, in his book: "Social Obstetrics and Gynæcology,"¹ that, "after the child has been apparently entirely cured, years later, if she is going to marry, the consent to the marriage should only be given after a test has been performed which has proved to be negative. Many obscure cases of gonorrhea in marriage may be traced to the childhood of the woman." In these circumstances, naturally, I must advise people to take the safest way, in spite of my own more favourable impressions.²

Women who have already been married must, before they contract another marriage, undergo a thorough gynæcological examination, and the physician must take this opportunity of making a bacteriological investigation.

At the present time, owing to the greater freedom of morals, and owing to the decrease in the observation that parents have over their daughters, it is more common and widespread than previously, to find that a marriageable girl has lost her virginity. Now, when it is no longer so rare to find young girls of good family in private gynæcological clinics, being treated for criminal abortion or for gonorrheal infection (this was indeed the exception ten years ago!), it is of far greater importance than previously for the man to protect himself from such unpleasant surprises in marriage.

That the greatest caution is necessary, on all sides, even in "suspicious cases of this nature" to avoid all possible difficulties, needs no comment, and it is self-evident that all this must take place in such a way as to avoid the mental shock that might be caused to a really "innocent" girl, even by the appearance of suspicion.

As a way out, assuring that the sensitiveness of the girl would not be injured, I advise that a medical examination

¹ Urban & Schwarzenberg, Vienna, 1928.

² Cf. Essays by *E. Vogt* in the *German Medical Weekly*, No. 13, 1926, and *Otto Herschan* in the same review, No. 23, 1927.

for life insurance should be chosen. Of course, the ordinary examination must be supplemented by a thorough gynæcological investigation, and this, of course, is only then of value if the doctor is told of the real purpose of the investigation.

Such an investigation, as I have explained previously, must take into account infantilism, anomalies of the pelvis, etc.

If such a medical certificate is requested, it need make no unpleasant impression, certainly not more than if the father asks his daughter's future husband to produce proofs of his health, including a statement with regard to the Wassermann test.

If the social conditions and customs of our time and our modern knowledge with regard to health in connection with marriage, are taken into consideration, it appears, in any case, unjust and senseless to demand a certificate of health from the man alone. Both parties have an equal right to this. For the same reasons, the man may demand that his wife marries with a good general constitution and healthy normal sexual organs, just as the woman is justified in demanding this from the man.

One further point in conclusion. If so thorough a medical investigation before marriage is considered offensive, the idea of a medical certificate should not be contemplated at all. I must confess that I quite well understand the feeling of aversion to this procedure, both in the parents and in the future husband of some girls, and I can quite realise that they are satisfied with a mutual and honourable declaration that, as far as they know, nothing is wrong with their health and so take the remaining risk on themselves.¹

¹ A man should only make such a statement if he has never caught a venereal disease (this "occurs"—far more often than the reader thinks, who smiles so sceptically at my apparent simplicity !) or if he has undergone a THOROUGH investigation a short time before he has made the statement.

The parents of a girl can, without a thorough medical examination, only then declare in good faith that their daughter is healthy and physically normal if, up to that time, no symptoms of disease of the sexual organs or inflammation of the abdominal cavity have occurred ; if menstruation is

This is a standpoint, one of sentiment that, as a man, I *can* quite understand.

What we have considered previously is another point of view, that of reason, and a physician must take this standpoint.

The one-sided compromise, lacking in every principle, unconsidered, and often unfair, between these two points of view, which so often takes the place of a serious "medical examination before marriage" does more harm than good, because the conclusion to which it leads is quite unfounded in fact, and because it deprives the "contracting parties" of the exchange of a statement based on faith and trust.

normal, and when it has been determined by medical examination, that the genitals and the pelvis are normally developed.

Certainly, even then there is a risk! For parents know their children least, as far as sexual affairs are concerned!

On the other hand, one may proceed in these matters in another way. This is to have no method at all and to do nothing, not even to reflect and to let come what may. This is the method which is followed by ignorance, and this is more often followed, sometimes for reasons of principle, but far more often owing to slackness or laziness;—and the result for married happiness? Experience has taught us enough about this.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CHOICE OF A PARTNER

PART FOUR

Character

IN what we have previously said, we have often remarked upon the importance of the character of the married couple. Those who treat of masculine and feminine qualities and ideas of life, are always dealing with character.

Nevertheless, this subject should occupy a special place, as it is most desirable that the man or woman who wish seriously to reflect upon his or her choice in marriage should thoroughly weigh up the character of the future partner.

The character of the future partner, but no less, and indeed more, the individual's own character. Self-knowledge, above all, is necessary for the man who desires to make the right choice ; and, if ever an academy for marriage science is established, it should choose for its motto the one inscribed above the Temple of Apollo at Delphi.

Naturally, we cannot contemplate an attempt to expound here the main principles of such an extremely difficult art as that of "Know thyself." It would also be wrong to make such demands on relatively young men and women who wish to marry. Only mature, exceptionally talented people are capable of self-analysis, such as has been carried out by *Count Keyserling* in "Men as Symbols."

I will, therefore, confine myself to drawing the attention of my readers to the seriousness of the problem of self-knowledge and its importance for marriage harmony, and endeavour to convince them that they, both before making their choice in marriage and later, in trying to maintain their married happiness unimpaired, must be able to say to

themselves, as far as their talents allow, with *Heraclitus*: "I have examined myself."

How can the person who is about to marry consider the character of the person he or she has chosen? That is now the problem.

There are two possibilities.

First, consideration should be given to the presence or absence of certain definite qualities of character which are of particular importance for marriage.

Secondly, and this is really the chief point, investigation of the character in general, regarded as a unity (which we will simply call character here). The question put above may be divided into two subsidiary questions.

I. What do we mean by the character of a person?—and

II. How, and in what manner, can this character be understood?

The newly awakened interest in character study (in spite of far too many writers having the most varied points of view and each having a different method), has made surprisingly rapid strides, and has led, in recent years, to the appearance of a great number of books which attempt to answer the questions here put forward. Confining myself to the most important of all these works, I must mention, first of all, the writings of a man who was a pioneer in the new science of character study: *Ludwig Klages*, whose "The Foundations of Character Study" appeared in 1926, as the fourth edition of his first book, "Principles of Characterology,"¹ published in 1910; *C. J. Jung's* "Psychological Types"² and *Ernst Kretschmer's* "Constitution and Character: (Investigations of the Constitutional Problem and of the Theory of Temperament³)," which, although they are entirely different and do not subscribe to the ideas propounded in *Klages'* book, which we have just mentioned, must be considered no less as pioneer works.

¹ J. A. Barth, Leipzig.

² Rascher & Co., Zürich, 1920.

³ Fourth Edition (Julius Springer, Berlin, 1924.).

Kretschmer's book like *Hermann Hoffmann's*: "The Problem of Character Building,"¹ which, as we have already seen in Chapter XI., deals, to a large extent, with an analysis of the personality from the hereditary point of view is also a product of the Tübinger Psychiatric School.

Hoffmann's point of view, as he himself says, is in agreement, in many respects, with those expressed by *Emil Utitz*, (also a leading personality in this sphere) in his book, "Characterology"²—an agreement which gives the reader the opportunity of a breathing space when seeking a path in the wilderness of the different opinions expressed on this subject. The books are all the more valuable as these two investigators reached their conclusions independently of one another, and by different methods.

With the addition to this small series, which has only taken into account books of fundamental importance, and even then makes no claim to completeness, of *Theodor Lessing's* "Principles of Characterology,"³ and observing, at the same time, that this eminent and highly talented psychologist has, for many years, taken up, in certain respects, a different standpoint from the others, I conclude my survey with the remark that he has published a new version of the standard work of our old-fashioned master *Karl Gustav Carus*:⁴ "Symbolism of the Human Form,"⁵ in which one may find,

¹ Julius Springer, Berlin, 1926.

² PanVerlag, Charlottenburg, 1925.

³ "German Psychology," IV., 2 (Carl Marhold, Halle on the Saale, 1926.)

⁴ This extraordinary man was born at Leipzig in 1789. At the age of 23 he became lecturer in comparative Anatomy in Dresden, and three years later Director of the Gynæcological Clinic, Dresden, where, as doctor and physician to the Royal House until his death in his eightieth year, he enjoyed a great reputation. He was esteemed, not only as a learned man who, as a lover of nature, explored the laws of natural philosophy from many points of view, but as a many-sided character with exceptional artistic talents (music, painting, drawing and etching—his water colours are even now held in high esteem). He also enjoyed *Goethe's* friendship for twenty years, and the exchange of thoughts between them fell on fruitful ground; *Lessing* (who called "The Symbolism of the Human Form" "a piece of Goethean natural science"), expresses the opinion that *Goethe's* influence may be seen everywhere in *Carus's* writings, both in his natural historical character study, artistic and philosophical writings. *Klages* and his disciples have contributed to a great extent to bringing *Carus's* work again into recognition. (*Carus's* "Psyche." Edited by *Klages*, and published by Eugen Diederich, Jena.)

⁵ Third Edition (Niels Campmann, Heidelberg, 1925).

besides an historical survey, a number of international monographs.¹

At this point I must leave the subject.² Most of my readers will not be interested to any great extent, in the purely scientific questions connected with this problem, and I must frankly state that the layman who does not take the trouble—by no means slight—thoroughly to study the books I have mentioned, may, at the end, find himself in *Faust's* position; "Here I stand, poor soul, as wise as I was before." Numerous periodicals that deal with character study in a wholly scientific, half-scientific, or purely popular way, will help to remove this feeling just as little as those more or less, but sometimes very valuable, books written by the minor masters, unless the reader has sworn fealty to one of the gods of the characterologic Olympus and leaves the others alone. There is such anarchy in this field in regard to classification and nomenclature (for example, of the various types) that the ideas and information of most of the authors can be compared only with difficulty and sometimes indeed not at all.

Therefore, until characterological science becomes more uniform, an achievement which will take many years, no answer can be given to the questions of those who do not penetrate profoundly enough to form their own independent opinions on the subject.

For us, in this book, one method only can be considered

¹ At the end of *Lessing's* book, "Principles of Characterology," he draws the attention of those of his readers who are thinking of applying themselves to the immeasurably wide field of characterology, to the severely critical collation of all accessible literature in the field of characterology (physiognomonic and pathognomonic) which has been undertaken by Dr. W. Rink as an introduction and material for his "History of Characterology."

² In spite of this, I cannot proceed without referring to *Fritz Künkel's* "Introduction to the Study of Character" (C. Hirzel, Leipzig, 1927). Those who read the very interesting essays that this author has written in particular on the attitude of man and woman to each other (for example, in the *International Review for Individual Psychology*, 3rd year, No. 6), cannot doubt that the statement of the characterological conceptions of this representative of the individual psychological school, will give great insight into the matter.

that enables us to give answers of practical *value* to the questions that we have mentioned previously, and also to those that will arise later from the subject of this chapter itself, "The Choice of a Partner and Character."

The method is the following : To keep the mind firmly fixed on practical matters, and to discount, as much as possible, the "learned" point of view ; to give an absolutely clear meaning to the words and conceptions employed and to avoid all ambiguity ; to abstain from speculation and imaginative theories ; to make the questions propounded as simple as possible, and to limit our demands so that they can be complied with.

Let us see what can be achieved by this method. First of all, we shall answer the questions above marked I., as follows :

We understand by a person's *character* the totality of the typical qualities as they appear to the external observer, which differentiate this person from another ; from a narrower point of view, the qualities which a person, a feeling and desiring being, *sui generis*, reveals in all his dealings and behaviour, in his reactions and impressions. Character is closely connected with *temperament* : that is, briefly, the permanent disposition of an individual—(as opposed to the momentary, more accidental, disposition) ; how his disposition is formed ; how his feelings arise, and what course they finally take, and also the force and rapidity of the mental emotions.

The *personality* of an individual is made up of the interplay of his own particular manner of thinking, of his typical mental qualities, together with his temperament and his character. It is the more strongly marked the more the mental qualities are developed, and is thus associated in its more clearly defined forms with a certain mental maturity (which implies at the same time a certain nobility of mind and a certain stage of life necessary to maturity).

We understand by *personality*, the potentiality, and by *temperament and character*, more the elemental.

In regard to choice in marriage, we shall have to confine ourselves (keeping within the limits we have set) to character and temperament, and leave the personality out of account. In practice we can consider these two qualities as a whole, which we will call, as a rule, the character of a person.¹ Sometimes, however, we shall speak of temperament or of temperament *and* character.

Generally speaking, character is determined by inherited factors; but is also influenced by the effect of the world around and by circumstances, particularly in that certain traits of character appear more in the foreground, while others are repressed. For this reason, the character must not be considered as a fixed quantity, for, within certain limits, it may undergo a change. We have already pointed this out in Chapter XI., where we emphasized the importance of family conditions for choice in marriage, and, with reference to the appearance of changes in character, mentioned the example of *Count Keyserling*. In various periods of his life, different groups of characteristics showed themselves to be dominant. We will further quote *Bleuler's* case, which is equally apposite.

The conclusion which does and should arise from the foregoing regarding the choice of a life partner has been already indicated; *i.e.*, not to turn the attention exclusively to the character of the proposed partner, but also to take into consideration the dominant characteristics of his or her family.

In answering question II., "How and in what way may the character be recognized?" we must distinguish between the direct and the indirect method.

If we really desire to *know* the character of a person, both methods must be employed together, and a most comprehensive, expert investigation must be made, similar to the case history chart drawn up by *Kretschmer* for re-

¹ Those who are scientifically interested in the question, should not fail to read *G. Ewald's* book, "Temperament and Character" (Julius Springer, Berlin, 1924). He has differentiated clearly between them.

search into criminological psychologically differentiated and psychiatric types, the diagram of which alone occupies ten printed pages.¹ I mention such a purely scientific process only to show that it is useless, as far as choice in marriage is concerned. Everyone will admit this, including a scientist like *Kretschmer* himself, who is none the less a practical man.

If we wish, by means of practical experience, to be able to *comprehend* the character of a person, years of intimacy are necessary, such as is possible in marriage alone, with the exception of cases of tried intimate friendship or of long and close co-operation in work. But how many married couples, who really understand something of these matters, would venture to maintain that they *know* the character of their partner even after long years of married life together? More is necessary for this than daily experience; first and foremost, there must be knowledge of human nature, and of mankind in general. We can, therefore, only rarely, and then only superficially, make use, in regard to choice in marriage, of the knowledge of character gained by the direct method.

The indirect method remains which, although it offers no exact basis for estimating the individual case, nevertheless gives useful indications. It enables us to reach fairly rapid conclusions which may be of great importance for choice in marriage, on the basis of existing mutual relationships (correlations), points of agreement (analogy), derivations (deductions) and probabilities.

To understand how this is possible, we must realize that the character of the individual is chiefly determined and dominated by his or her constitution, and, further, that this constitution is also expressed in the physical formation.

We cannot deal with the *constitution* and the ideas connected with it as thoroughly as the subject deserves. It is as old as medical science itself, and underwent great changes according to the various points of view of pathology,

¹ "Medizinische Psychologie" (George Thieme, Leipzig, 1926).

remaining always a more or less undetermined, or, in any case, an inadequately determined conception. As soon as an attempt is made accurately to define this, speculative considerations must be accepted as established observations. We cannot, therefore, be surprised that, in a time when the microscope was always revealing new and more important secrets, the value of what could be seen, counted and measured was over-estimated; thus, the not very exact conception of the constitution was rejected and, thereby, life was seen, so to speak, only with blinkers on.

Since we have learned, however, that, by proceeding in this way no less numerous insoluble problems were encountered into which we were able to obtain more insight when other methods of thought and work came to be employed; ever since biochemistry has co-operated to solve the riddle of the normal and abnormal processes of life; ever since the theory of internal secretion has taken a more and more important place in psychiatric considerations, and the exact knowledge of the laws of heredity has shown us how much we may know and how much, to a far greater extent, we cannot know; since that time, the constitution, which had been expelled from the realms of science with so many other things that were considered unnecessary, has been restored to its place.

It is true that this conception, even from the modern point of view, is by no means accurately described and clearly defined, and its relative indefiniteness provides a reason for those who still desire to cling to the illusion of the visible, measurable and ponderable, to oppose its reintroduction. But, even if it were possible, it *must not* be clearly defined, for it must maintain that elasticity it requires to form a framework in which the results of research (which is always progressing and showing us fresh points of view), may be included. To physicians who think along modern lines, constitution is more than an undefined conception; it is the expression which places before our mental vision a totality of qualities of the individual being, or, more broadly, a comprehensive group of individual beings whose qualities we partly *know*; whose nature we can sometimes *conjecture*

and which we feel in part ; " only " conjecture but, nevertheless, feel that they must be there. By this means we obtain, not only a certain insight into otherwise entirely inexplicable experiences regarding greater or less susceptibility to diseases, but also some conception of the origin of individual differences which we may observe in all conceivable expressions of life.

The situation, as we now see it, is that the most important factors which govern the constitution are the qualities determined by inherited predisposition, and the functional performance of the internal secretion glands. It must be considered in this respect, that the personal peculiarities of the internal secretion of human beings are, again to a great degree, dependent on the inherited disposition, and that, *vice versâ*, the remaining physical and mental qualities which he or she inherits must be traced back to the peculiarities of the internal secretion of his or her forefathers.

Other than inherited factors may also exercise an influence on the organisms that go to form an individual which is later also stamped on his constitution. I recall what I have said previously about the damage to the organisms caused by syphilis, and I point to the possibility of the injurious influence of alcohol and other poisons. I take this opportunity of quoting a physical example of such an effect in the damage done to the male and female germ cells by X-rays. Both during the intra-uterine life, as also in the course of further development, influences of various kinds may be at work which more or less alter the constitution of a human being. Finally, such influence is still possible in adults. We only need to turn our thoughts to *Sellheim's* case, mentioned previously, in which the whole constitution, the sexual characteristics, the appearance and character of a woman underwent very marked changes owing to the development of a small tumour in the ovary. But do we not see very typical and very clear *physiological* changes appear in the constitution when the sex glands begin to operate and when they cease to function ?

What we have said should suffice to give an idea of the

importance of what we call the constitution. We must let the matter rest here, however much we may be tempted to make further remarks about so interesting a subject.

The chief point for our purpose is to note that the constitution, to a great extent, is dependent directly or indirectly on the action of the internal secretion glands. Since the products of these glands of secretion are called hormones, the whole of this structure can be co-ordinated ; in the expression " the hormonal system and its functions," the action of each of the glands in itself and the action of the various glands together in the whole organism or in one of its particular parts and, further, the effect which they exert on each other. It should never be forgotten by the observer who desires to study the problem more deeply, that these functions are closely connected with those of the nervous system, and, in particular, with those of the vegetative nervous system ; and that the reciprocal effect between these and the hormonal system, is very active and extremely important.

We must further note that the constitution is expressed both in the character and in the conformation of the body. Changes in the functions of the hormonal system, whether they are caused by too much or too little secretion of one or other of the glands, or by the production of abnormal hormones or, finally, by a disturbance of the equilibrium of the reciprocal effect, will result in changes both in the character and in the formation of the body ; and a clear and definite correlation exists between these two effects. For example, Eunuchoidism¹ of the character and formation of the body owing to a deficiency in the internal secretion of the sex glands ; mental—also in as far as the personal character is concerned—and physical cretinism, owing to definite changes in the thyroid gland. A final conclusion, which is theoretically entirely acceptable : *the connection between the character and the formation of the body, in the sense that we can deduce in typical cases from the visible what is probably the nature of the invisible.*

¹ Incomplete sexual development with poorly developed secondary sexual characters. (Translator's Note.)

We have dealt adequately with theory. We shall next consider the problem exclusively from its practical aspect.

Most authors who treat of this subject divide characters into several groups. The number of these groups alternates between two and sixty-four.

It is desirable, generally speaking, to proceed from two main groups. For more accurate differentiation each of these main groups can be divided and subdivided as may be considered desirable. For our purpose, however, it is best to confine ourselves in the main to these two chief groups. A short, more or less systematic, description of the qualities by which these two groups are recognized will be found in *L. van der Horst's* excellent work: "Constitutional Types in the Sane and Insane."¹ *Van der Horst* describes the typical characteristics of the first group as follows:

"Sociable, good-natured, friendly and talkative, calm and deliberate, although, in society, versatile and lively but never conspicuous; unconstrained in their behaviour, polite in a simple way, but not flatterers; naturally gay, harmonious in all reactions; the mental outlook changing, sometimes nervous and cautious, at other times care-free and serene. Sometimes thrifty and then generous. . . . Frank, honest and uncomplicated, thinking about the past or living for the day, decided and practical, sympathetic, emotional, religious, loving children, humorous, kind and not unbendingly dogmatic; loving nature and a simple life and also realistic books, works on nature and books of travel."

The second group:

"Generally absent minded, quiet and retiring; gay in society from time to time, but exaggerated and unnatural; not companionable, in the general sense of the word, but fastidiously sociable; shy, nervous, sometimes hypersensitive and at other times indifferent and cool; irritable, impulsive, enthusiastic, idealistic, ego-centric, sometimes apparently altruistic, but having, in reality, little sympathy with the world around them; not sympathetic; and, generally, not fond of children; mentally difficult and

¹ (Amsterdam, 1924.)

complicated; inclined to think in abstract terms; looking forward into the future; dreamy and not humorous; preferring intellectual pastimes and idealistic, curious and imaginative books."

Van der Horst summarizes here the basic type of these two groups of characters. He does this, as I have already said, more or less according to schedule and, therefore, at times in a rather exaggerated way, so that certain qualities, that are certainly typical of these two groups are, nevertheless, somewhat over-accentuated as far as the ordinary average individual is concerned. Apart from this it must be realized that not all the qualities mentioned of one group fit in with the character of each of the so-called members of that group. This is obvious because certain of these qualities definitely contrast with one another.

It is, therefore, desirable to enlarge the scope of this characterization according to the information given by *Kretschmer* with regard to the first group in his book, "Physical Constitution and Character," :

I. The cheerful talkative people;

II. The unruffled people with a sense of humour who calmly go their own way; here and there making some charming comment, in society, for instance, and who can be lively and witty.

"They are satisfied with the world and have a natural kindness for human beings and for children. They dislike only haughtiness and cold calculation. They are faithful friends, live and let live, and are very skilful at managing people; they prefer outspoken, honest and simple people." I quote the following passage from one of the letters of *Goethe's* mother as a particularly apposite example of self-criticism in a woman who might be called the prototype of this group¹: "I enjoy my life because the spark is still there; I seek no thorny ways. I love the small pleasures of life. If the doors are too low, I bend; if I can remove a stone from the path, I do so; if it is too heavy, I go round

¹ This quotation is engraved under the portrait which forms the frontispiece to *Frau Aja, Goethe's Mother* in the "Letters and Recollections of *Bettina Brentano*," edited by *Käthe Tischerdorf*. (Wilhelm Langewiesche Brandt, Munich.)

it, and so I find something in every day that pleases me, and the corner stone, my belief in God, makes my heart glad and my face smiling."

III. The calm man of sentiment, conscientious and good, sympathetic without talking about it, rather lethargic and soft-hearted ;

IV. Those who enjoy life comfortably ;

V. The active practical man who combines the fresh, lively vitality of the first type with the conscientiousness and sound common sense of the types mentioned in II. and III.

The main group characterized here is called that of "*cyclothyme*" persons. This is formed from two Greek words, the first meaning a circle and the second breast (in the sense of the mind, or the soul which, in ancient times, was believed to have its seat in the breast).¹ Undulating processes changing, more or less regularly and alternating between two extremes are usually termed "*cyclic*" by physicians. To quote an example that is of particular importance in connection with the theme of this book, phenomena which I describe as "the undulatory movement of the vital functions in the feminine organism"² are called by others "*cyclic changes*" ("*cycle of menstruation*").

On the borderland of the *cyclothyme* main group are those characters that stand on the furthest wing mentioned under point I.—the specially gay, lively and talkative people. They approach indeed the maniacally diseased, but are found in a relatively large proportion among those of perfectly healthy and sound mind.

On the other wing are found the extreme characters which are to be placed among those types mentioned in point III. They are very sentimental, thick-blooded people. They approach very closely the borderland of pathological depression, and are, as opposed to those who are not far removed from the maniac type, found comparatively seldom among healthy people. In other words, people who belong to

¹ *Kretschmer* chose this designation because it is well known that those persons suffering from a certain mental disease—manic-depressive or *circular* psychosis—belong to this constitutional group.

² Cf. "*Ideal Marriage, Its Physiology and Technique.*" 1928.

this type are in danger, certainly if these characteristics are strongly marked, of contracting melancholia. Experience shows us that this disease appears most frequently in women in the climacteric period, which is proved conclusively by what we have said previously in regard to the influence exercised by the internal secretion of the glands on the mental constitution.

Between these two extremes are the more moderate characters mentioned in points II., IV. and V. The characteristic example of this type of the middle paths is found in the second of *Kretschmer's* points—the 'mentally balanced. They are harmonious, mentally and spiritually sound, adapting themselves naturally and simply to every environment, making their own paths through the world and taking their happiness where they find it. They know how to enjoy things with their minds and senses, have goodwill towards everyone, and enjoy giving pleasure to others, although knowing how to maintain their own points of view. They are ready and capable of strenuous and reasoned work, and combine practical logical thought with an attitude of mind that strives towards an unattainable ideal.

Such characters, belonging to the middle ranks of the cyclothyme main group, we term, using *Bleuler's* expression, "syntonic," equivalent to "harmonious."

The second group of characters comprises the *schizothymes* (formed from the Greek words "splitting" or "dividing" and "breast.")¹

¹ The original reason for this nomenclature was that it was noticed that those who suffered from a certain form of insanity—schizophrenia (*dementia præcox*) belonged to this second main group of characters.

The peculiarities which we notice in the diseased mind of the person suffering from circular *manic-depressive* psychosis, expressed in its most exaggerated form, we find among the normal and healthy, among cyclothyme persons. The characteristics of the second group are found also among mentally normal schizothyme people, but, in that case, within the borders of the normal. Such people, whose mental condition is on the wide borderland between healthy and unhealthy, are called by *Kretschmer*, if they belong to the first group, "cycloid," and, if they belong to the second group, "schizoid." Other authors, however, apply these words to absolutely healthy cyclothyme and schizothyme persons. At first, *Kretschmer* was attacked for taking up the standpoint of the psychia-

Kretschmer gives the following characteristics of these types :

I. Distinguished, fastidious people, who think a great deal about their own personality, and often cultivate it to an exaggerated extent. They know and observe continuously the small details of their mental life. They show the most subtle sensitiveness for moods and momentary depression, and they are easily wounded in the society of their fellow-men. On the other hand, they can have the most intimate and tender feelings for those few people who stand nearest to them. But they always keep a certain distance, even with those with whom they are most closely connected. This is almost unnoticeable, but quite definite. It is the type of the aristocrat in the best sense, a real nobleman both in regard to birth and attitude to life ;

II. The idealists whose minds are centred on things not of this world.

III. The cold " master " natures and egotists.

IV. The dry, dull, narrow-minded (the type of the dried-up official).

While the cyclothyme people are characterized by their relatively simple uncomplicated natures, the characteristic of the schizothyme lies in their complex natures (as the name indicates).

The schizothyme person is at war with himself. His mind is divided and his heart feels drawn in two entirely different directions, so that it would appear that two people lived in him, as if two souls were battling in his heart. We encounter such ideas in the literature of all times : " Two men are in me . . . the one is all spirit and of heaven. . . . The other with heavy weight, holds me bound to the earth," *Racine* (" Cantiques Spirituels ") ; *Wieland's* " Two souls, I know it all too well, battle in my heart with the equal force "

trist to an exaggerated extent. Apart from the question, if such an attack might be considered at all justifiable, it has lost that justification, since *van der Horst's* investigations and *Kretschmer's* own further research work in connection with a large number of healthy persons, and the observations of other scientists have shown in the most convincing manner that the contrast, " cyclothyme-schizothyme," applies to entirely healthy persons.

("The Choice of Hercules"), and the famous quotation from *Faust*.

This internal division, this "difficulty with himself," which is characteristic of the schizothyme, and is felt by those around him, makes him suffer, the finer, the more highly strung he is. This is found particularly strongly in artists who very often belong to this group. This type is, to a certain extent, opposed from the start to the world around him. On the one hand he feels himself superior to it, but, on the other hand, he is sensitive, more or less, indeed, hypersensitive to the impressions he receives from it, and often also to the impression that he makes upon it. This is one reason why companionship with schizothyme people is difficult on both sides, and is, in any case, by no means easy. There are, however, other reasons, and the reader himself can imagine them without very much trouble.

But we must return to the study of cyclothyme and schizothyme characters, particularly with reference to women.

First of all, however, we must deal with the various physical formations that are connected with the one or the other of the groups of characters, as determined by the constitution.

We came to the conclusion, in the theoretical observations that have preceded the grouping of these characters, that present-day scientific knowledge absolutely justifies us in accepting the existence of reciprocal associations between physical formation and character. But, as is so often the case, artistic intuition and experience in daily life, which is always changing but remains ever the same, has not waited for scientific approbation to express its belief that certain characters and certain physical formations go together. We could quote examples from proverbs and a great number of phrases, sayings, and poems from the works of writers. But we shall confine ourselves to what we can actually *observe*.

I look along my bookcase and my eyes fall upon an

illustrated edition of the immortal *Don Quixote*.¹ The wandering knight and his squire, prototypes of an extreme schizothyme and a clearly defined cyclothyme person. How are they drawn by the artist? Just as they lived in *Cervantes'* imagination. The one tall and lean, and the other short and fat (Illustration 1).

I look further along the row of books, and I stop at an illustrated edition of *Molière's* works.² I turn over the pages and come upon a picture of *Don Juan*, on the first page of that comedy, and further on I notice a portrait of *Chrysale*, the husband and father of the "Femmes Savantes" with the motto, "I love rest, peace and gentleness." How does the artist imagine the typically schizothyme *Don Juan*? Presumably he had no idea of scientific psychology, but was able to depict his characters by intuition and experience of life. He depicts *Don Juan* as a tall, thin man with drooping shoulders, a prominent nose and rather an angular profile (Illustration 2). *Chrysale*,³ the cyclothyme man that loves peace and quiet above all? He is depicted as a good-natured, corpulent, short, stocky man with a round-oval face (Illustration 3). So much as an introduction.

If we wish now to explain the position of things, our thoughts turn first of all to the scientific data collected by *Kretschmer, van der Horst* and others, with the aid of statistical investigations, accurate measurements and psychological experiments. I am greatly tempted to write at length about this. It is, however, impossible, and I cannot give the short historical summary I would like.

Such a digression would not be in keeping with the principle we have already stated: to confine ourselves to practical questions and practical results. I must keep to this principle, for I do not wish to devote too much space to my explanations.

¹ Pieter de Hondt, The Hague, 1746.

² Laplace, Sanchez & Cie., Paris, 1875.

³ Naturally Molière depicted his characters in the way that appeared most convenient to him, at the same time keeping an eye to their effect on the audience, *his* audience. The two persons I have mentioned above should, therefore, be regarded as types only in so far as I have here considered them for my purpose.

We shall proceed, therefore, to the results of research work, which leaves nothing to be desired as far as practice is concerned, without describing the methods by which these results have been attained.


The *pycnic formation* goes with the cyclothyme character.

It is short and stocky, rather rounded and with short limbs. The skull is usually more or less round. The interspace between the occiput and forehead is not very much greater than the breadth. The occiput shows a slight even arch and merges gradually into the neck. In older people, a slightly curved line runs to the larynx. This line also makes the whole head appear round. People belonging to this type look well nourished (sometimes inclining to stoutness) and usually have a fresh complexion. The frame is fragile, which is easily recognizable particularly in the skull and the face ; but, more especially, however, in the short and broad but delicately formed hands, and also in the graceful wrists. These people are inclined to stoutness which may be observed particularly in the face, the throat, the stomach and in the thighs. A typical pycnic person is not only short, but also stout, which increases the impression of the stocky formation of the body.

It should not be forgotten that this fat formation is often absent in young men of the pycnic type, that is to say, people under thirty, until they reach the age of thirty-five, and among those whose work requires a great deal of muscular effort. Therefore, even if the body is not remarkably short, it may nevertheless be determined or at least presupposed that they belong to the pycnic group, chiefly owing to the general impression they make, combined with an estimate of the frame, which is shown by the hands, the wrists, the more or less short neck and by the facial formation.

As far as the facial formation is concerned, the profile is even, not projecting and slightly curved. The various portions of the face (forehead, the mid-facial, nose and chin) are well proportioned. The nose is fleshy, that is to say, it is not particularly bony, large or aquiline. The shape of

the lips and chin is harmonious; and the whole gives a well-built impression, which is not, however, "interesting." The facial formation is more typical and more easily recognizable seen full face, because the face looked at from this angle clearly shows the form of a pentagon or of a broad shield. (See the accompanying figures, which are taken from *Kretschmer's* books.)



Pictures give a better idea of the formation of the body than a description, if those studying them know what should be observed.

As I now consider that I have explained the most important characteristics of the pycnic type, I shall ask the reader to look carefully at Illustrations 4 to 24, which show this physical and facial formation, not only as far as the general impression is concerned, but also in regard to the details.

The most important characteristics of the pycnic woman can be found in Illustration 4. This woman is more or less an exaggerated type, and is by no means idealized, but the photograph is true to life. This woman was chosen as the example by *Mathes*,¹ who is regarded as one of the founders of the modern constitutional theory of woman, because she clearly showed the characteristics of "a youthful figure with good sexual differentiation." This was *Mathes'* name for this type, which is identical with *Kretschmer's* Typus Pycnicus. Her whole behaviour, in particular the attitude of unconcern she displays towards the serious disease from which she was suffering, and also her gaiety, show that type of mind which belongs to this physical group.

¹ *Halban and Seitz*, "Textbook of Gynæcology," Vol. III. (Urban and Schwarzenberg, Vienna).

The next illustration shows a type of pycnic woman which is included for more æsthetic reasons, Illustration 5 (*Raphael's* "The Three Graces" in the Musée Condé at Chantilly). The two women standing on the right are fairly typical pycnic figures.

Illustrations 6, 7 and 8 are three photographs taken from *C. H. Stratz's* well-known book, "The Beauty of the Feminine Body."¹ They need no explanation, but the girl on the left in the eighth illustration should only be observed. The other body has too many faults (among others, she is knock-kneed). I did not wish to omit the photograph of the Javanese woman, in spite of the difference in race, because this body (the face should not be taken into consideration) is an excellent example of the pycnic form, and, at the same time, the type of a fully developed feminine body. The same thing can be said of the woman holding the spear in Illustration 9, who was photographed in a modern school for gymnastics. This mature body should be compared with the portrait of a sixteen-year-old girl from the same gymnasium, Illustration 10, and with that of a somewhat more mature girl (Illustration 11).²

I give two examples of the pentagonal facial form in Illustration 12 (*Holbein's* "Anne of Cleves") (the Louvre) and in Illustration 13 (*Perugino's* "Madonna with Child and John" (Städelsches Institut, Frankfurt-am-Main); although they do not show the angles to a sufficiently marked degree, owing to the feminine curves, I have chosen them because they are otherwise typical pycnic figures. (Observe the hands.) To show the shield type of face, I have included *Perugino's* "Madonna with Two Saints" (Louvre) in Illustration 14. Here, too, the features are definitely pycnic.

Illustration 15, *Perugino's* self-portrait from the Exchange at Perugia, links up with the men of the pycnic type. I

¹ Fortieth Edition (Ferdinand Enke, Stuttgart, 1925).

² Illustration taken from *Ploss-Bartels' "Woman"* (William Heinemann (Medical Books) Ltd., London).

chose this portrait not because the round face shows either of the contours described above, but because its whole appearance gives the impression of a man of undoubted pycnic-cyclothyme constitution. (Similar to *Raphael's* reputed portrait *Perugino*, in the Galleria Borghese, which is not included here.) This is of particular importance because it explains why the artist preferably chose pycnic models. It is well known that people understand that group of characters best to which they themselves belong. We can observe this in artists and poets and also in scientists who describe and explain psychological processes.

Illustrations 16 and 17 show a man of pycnic formation, but he lacks the stoutness of build. This is not only because he is relatively young, but because of his gymnastic training, for the muscles are more strongly developed as a result of these exercises, and are thus more clearly visible than is the rule in pycnic men. This body, however, makes a stocky impression to a certain extent, which does not and need not take away from the fact, that it is as a whole well proportioned and well built.

In Illustration 18 we have the portrait of the Grand Duke *Charles Augustus* in the Park (taken from "Life in Old Weimar" by *William Bode* and sketched by *C. A. Schwertgebuth*), which is a characteristic example of the elderly pycnic man.

I conclude the series with two portraits of middle-aged women. The first is a picture of *Goethe's* mother (Illustration 19), taken from *Dorow's* "Reminiscences" (Leipzig, 1842). I show this both to demonstrate the pycnic profile (which, however, as far as the nose and forehead are concerned, leaves something to be desired as an illustration of the *typical* form), but also chiefly to show the outward appearance of the "Frau Rat," with all its clearly defined syntonic character. Illustrations 20 and 21 are one of those pycnic-syntonic women, fortunately still numerous,

who are a blessing to their husbands and children, but whose life is only known by those who have the privilege to come into contact with them.

The *leptosome* form goes with the schizothyme character. These people can generally be typified as tall and thin. They have a long throat and narrow face, generally, well formed aquiline nose (that is to say a projecting, angular profile in the sense that the angle of the boundary calculated from the point of the nose, runs back, upwards and downwards), while the full face is oval. The arms and legs are long in comparison with the total length of the body, and the fingers and toes are long, but not pointed. The hands and feet are inclined to be of a bluish-red colour, but the complexion is usually more or less pale.


The leptosome form is in the middle of two extremes, and must, in certain cases, be considered as a mixture of these two forms: The *asthenic* and the *athletic*,¹ which, in the main, have the characteristics mentioned above in common with the schizothyme character, but, and this is why they are extremes! vary greatly, which can be seen from the terms used to describe them.

The asthenic person has narrow sloping shoulders; in the athletic person, they are broad, horizontal and squarely built. In the former, the thorax is long and arched. The vertebral column of the asthenic person is bent forwards in the cervical region, while the shoulder blades are curved. The athletic type has a straight back. The long bony fingers of the one type are in contrast with the exceptionally large, broad hands, and thick fingers of the other. In this connection, a typical characteristic of the athletic person must be mentioned: the coarse build of the whole frame.

In people of asthenic form, and *they* are the real leptosome types, the angular profile and the projection of the occiput is noticeable, which is not observed in the athletic types. In these people, the size of the head and, in particular, the

¹ Asthenic—feeble; Athletic—vigorous.

mid-facial measurements (the distance between the nostrils and the mouth) and also the length and breadth of the nose, are striking. Owing to these differences in the build of the head, the frontal outline in the athletic type is steep (*a*) and in the asthenic, retracted, oval (*b*).



The "mixed" leptosome forms alternate between steepness and retraction.

The *Habitus asthenicus* (the asthenic form combined with the asthenic deportment), denotes in men, particularly in well-defined cases, illness, or at least a predisposition to certain diseases (compare the *habitus phthisicus*). This is far more often the case in the woman, not only because the predisposition to tuberculosis (particularly of the lungs) is the same as in the man of this type, but because disturbances in the organs of the abdomen often occur in asthenic girls and women. These disturbances may consist both in a general dropping of the intestines, and in incomplete development of the sexual organs with the resultant consequences.

The athletic formation of the body is normal for man. This does not mean that a man can only be considered normal if he is of athletic build. The physical formation of the well-built pycnic man may also be called normal, and the same is the case with the mixed forms between these two types. But a markedly athletic bodily formation in a man shows that there is no abnormal growth, nor defective features in any respect, provided that the body is more or

less correctly proportioned. There are men, however, who belong to this type, or appear to approach it, who have either a tendency to unusual corpulence or display in other ways an imperfect balance in the functions of their hormonal system. The defect usually is that the sex glands do not produce enough internal secretion while the pituitary body (appendix to the brain) gives too much. It is obvious that such a disturbance of the constitutional equilibrium can also be expressed in the character of the person.

As far as woman is concerned there are athletic women, in whom no disturbance of any kind can be observed, and who may be considered entirely normal on account of this. If, however, the markedly athletic type is considered, and a thorough observation is made of the individual physical and mental peculiarities (in particular the reciprocal effect between body and mind) women who can be called normal in this respect are comparatively rarely found; for an unusual proportion of masculinity is almost always found and is, indeed, generally conspicuous. The gynecologist is aware that disturbances of the sexual functions, as the result of insufficient development of the internal genital organs (for example, too little action of the ovary), are often encountered in women of this type. Even in the less striking cases a certain masculinity may be observed in athletically built women. Generally, therefore, athletic characteristics in the woman should be regarded as being abnormal, that is to say, as not typically feminine.

A picture of the athletic type of woman is shown in Illustration 22, and of the asthenic in Illustrations 23 and 24. Both have been taken from *Mathes'* monograph, which we have already mentioned. I confine myself, as far as the first example is concerned, to the reproduction of the profile. But in Illustrations 23 and 24 I show this "inter-sexual schizothymica" as *Mathes* so aptly calls her, both from the side view and from the front view; because both pictures show characteristic peculiarities of this type. I mention the following peculiarities which are the most important to be

observed in this profile: the (not particularly marked) angular formation of the face, the way in which the head is carried (forwards), the long throat, the flat thorax, the typical form of the abdomen with its projecting lower part, the form and attitude of the lower part of the vertebral column, and the flat and flaccid buttocks. More important, however, than these details is the general impression made by the attitude of this woman, an impression which is best given by the picture in profile. On the other hand, a characteristic which is also important may be seen in the other picture. This is that in an upright position, with the legs together, the inner surfaces of the thighs do not lie close to each other.

We must make two further observations with regard to this asthenic type: the first is that asthenic women, to be included in this group—and this is true of leptosome bodies generally—need not necessarily be tall. The characteristics we have mentioned, and also the proportion of the various parts of the body to each other, but particularly the deportment, are to be taken as the standard. The second observation is that women who belong to the asthenic type, do not always have such a resolutely masculine facial expression as that of *Mathes'* patient. They may indeed have charming, really feminine features. An example of this is shown in *Botticelli's* "Venus" ("The Birth of Venus"), Florence, Uffizi Gallery, Illustration 25. She is much more feminine, indeed completely feminine, although she clearly shows asthenic characteristics. Some of them cannot be seen, or less clearly, in the figure; the oval line of the face, the longer throat and particularly the narrow sloping shoulders and the long arms. *Botticelli's* reason for painting his Venus as an asthenic woman, was not only that his supposed model had the *habitus phtisicus*, and did indeed die from consumption at the age of twenty-three. If this had been the case, he would have had no reason to paint the women in his "Primavera" and in "Calunnia" (which are both in the Uffizi), as asthenic or at least leptosome in form. No, his tendency to paint just this type of woman must be explained first and foremost by his own schizothyme

character.¹ Further, his paintings were undoubtedly determined by the fashion or rather the taste of the times, that is to say, by the taste that was dominant in many circles in that seething transition period of the early Renaissance. I adduce the following remarkable proof of the preference for leptosome women which I found in one of *Francesco del Cossa's* frescoes, in the Great Hall of the Palazzo Schifanoia in Ferrara (now the Municipal Museum): in the part portraying the Triumph of Venus, "The Three Graces" (Illustration 26, right-hand side above) are shown in the same attitude and position (apart from minor details) as *Raphael's* "Three Graces" in Illustration 5. *Del Cossa's* Graces are typical examples of leptosome (not asthenic) women, while, as we have seen, *Raphael* presented them as pycnic women.² Comparative observation of the two groups is interesting, not only from the standpoint of the history of art and characterology, but also because it helps us to understand the difference between the two types of feminine physique, delineated without exaggeration.

Finally, there was another important reason for the preference shown for leptosome figures at that time, and previously, in painting and in the plastic arts (though to a much lesser degree). This was the worship of saints. Artists depicted, sometimes of their own free will, but often to order, saints in a great part of their work, and a saint is a schizothyme-leptosome being. The artist always felt

¹ No one who has read *Giorgio Vasari's* "Life of the Artist" or *E. V. Lucas's* "A Wanderer in Florence" (Methuen & Co., London) can doubt this schizothyme character. Although the only self-portrait we possess of him—the figure in the right-hand corner of "The Adoration of the Magi" in the Uffizi—does not allow of any diagnosis of his physical formation.

² It is highly probable that he was under the influence of *Perugino*, his pycnic teacher. Probably this picture, painted on wood, was executed about 1500 in Perugia, when *Raphael* was only eighteen years old. He certainly did not know the work of *del Cossa* at this time which was finished in 1470. *Del Cossa* himself died in 1477. It is likely that both chose a prototype from ancient times, and presumably worked on reproductions of a Roman copy of a Greek group. This copy was found in 1460, in the Palazzo Colonna, and was presented by the then Cardinal *Francesco Piccolomini* (later Pope *Pius III.*) to his native town of Sienna, where it is still one of the treasures in the library of the Cathedral. It is worth mentioning that the figures of this ancient group depict leptosome bodies rather than pycnic.

this strongly. It is for this reason that in pictures of saints painted by artists of many lands and schools, we encounter numerous examples of leptosome and often asthenic figures. We have now dealt sufficiently with the asthenic type, and I therefore show in Illustration 27, *Memling's* undoubtedly leptosome "John the Baptist and Mary Magdalen" (Louvre), although I must observe here that, as far as the abdomen is concerned, there is a strong suspicion of asthenia.

More or less pure leptosome figures (the semi-asthenic attitude of the woman is a result of pregnancy—and we will not go into the question of the disproportion between her trunk and her legs which are too short, as it would take up too much space) are shown us by the same artist in his "Adam and Eve" (Illustration 28) on the outside of the panels of a small tryptich (Vienna Picture Gallery), which also gives an interesting example of such physique on the inside; two leptosome saints on the panels and a Madonna with a typical oval face in the centre. Examples from daily life will be found in *Alice Bloch's* book—"The Harmonious Training of the Female Body"¹—of a number of really leptosome women, I mean by this, neither inclining towards the asthenic nor towards the athletic type. Undoubtedly these bodies are perfectly well built. Their figures, which are shown remarkably well, owing to the lack of fat formation and owing to the training of the muscles, indicate health in every way, but nevertheless, these bodies display a more than a usual strain of masculinity, of certain intersexuality, which makes a gynæcologist, who has been trained in psychology, feel that he would like to know more about these people before he could give his consent without reluctance to a son of his marrying a girl with such a figure. A feeling (that is to say that the physician is guided here more by intuition than by reflection) that does not arise, or at any rate to a much lesser degree, if the person concerned is a pycnic and entirely feminine person, even when their muscles are so trained, as in the cases mentioned above.

¹ Published by Dieck & Co., Stuttgart.

Illustration 29, a copy of a photograph taken in the *Hagemann* Physical Training School, shows two leptosome women to whom the remarks I have just made apply entirely, even to a greater degree than in the case mentioned previously.

There will be less reluctance in regard to the entirely feminine figure, shown in Illustration 30. It is a photograph of a marble statue, named "Charis," by *Fritz Klimsch* in the possession of *Frau Ilse Röchling-Heye*. Her form is truly feminine with no trace of masculinity, and she represents the typically leptosome, non-asthenic figure of the clearly defined schizothyme woman.

Good leptosome female figures, by which I mean such as are neither clearly asthenic nor undoubtedly athletic, and which do not show in other respects any noticeable deficiency in femininity or an excess in masculinity, but who do not possess any specially pycnic characteristics are difficult to find. If they are sought for in gymnastic institutes or in ball rooms (the clothing makes almost no difference), one is just as disappointed as if one tries to choose out a figure from a collection of photographs taken from life, fulfilling the conditions mentioned and at the same time well built (beauty). Mixed forms of the various types are often encountered, and, in particular, those whose proportions are impaired by this; usually the most noticeable point is the disproportion between the trunk and the legs (a disproportion that is met with in many works of art, both ancient and modern). The formation of an opinion from nude photographs is made extremely difficult, because these are almost always taken in a position which is not simple, since a natural upright attitude is necessary to real diagnosis of the formation of the body.

I show the best leptosome woman that I can find in Illustration 31, but I must admit that I do not even consider this photograph to be beyond reproach. First, owing to the nature of the attitude, and because I cannot rid myself of the impression that this is a body which approaches more or less the middle type, and is, therefore, to a certain extent, a mixed form, even if well proportioned, depicting

a dominant leptosome type. To conclude the small series, I show in Illustration 33, a photograph of English girls who approach more nearly the middle mixed forms but, nevertheless, make a clearly leptosome general impression.

Turning now to male bodies, we can see the best type in Illustration 32. This body called by *C. H. Stratz*, a "normal male figure,"¹ is undoubtedly characteristic of the athletic type, which is not to be wondered at from what we have said previously. On the other hand, the young man whose photograph appears in Illustration 34 (taken from *Hans Surén's* book: "Man and the Sun"²) shows leptosome characteristics which, if they do not tend towards the abnormal, nevertheless, incline in a most striking manner towards the asthenic pole.

Examples of the type of leptosome masculine body of the middle range in its best and most powerful form, trained to perfection by rational gymnastics, are shown in Illustrations 35, 36 and 37, which are also taken from *Surén's* book.

We shall conclude this small series of leptosome males, with a picture of Charles the First of England (Illustration 38) by *Van Dyck* (The Louvre). Even if the figure does not give the impression of height, it is the leptosome Grand Seigneur to the life. If we consider the face, which shows in this three-quarter pose, both the oval formation of the frontal contour and the indication of the angular profile, the long throat, the flat thorax, the slightly bent upper part of the back and the somewhat contracted loins, the more or less projecting *hypogastrium*, the long arms and the long slenderly formed feet, which are not hidden by the soft leather of the boots: consider, above all, the whole attitude, the elegant way the hair is done, the way in which the hat is worn, the stick is carried, and last, but not least, the expression of the face. After this, there is no need to read a description of the King's character in *von Pflugk-Hartung's* "History of the World"³ to realize that in this leader

¹ *C. H. Stratz*, "The Beauty of the Feminine Body" (F. Enke, Stuttgart).

² Sixtieth Edition (*Dieck & Co.*, Stuttgart).

³ Published by Ullstein, Berlin.

and prototype of the Cavalier, as opposed to the Roundheads, is revealed not only the leptosome type, but also, at the same time, the schizothyme man.

Pascal and *Calvin* are two other examples of famous schizothyme men, with typical leptosome angular profiles. Their portraits are so well known that there is no need to include them here.

In Illustrations 39, 40 and 41, I show some little known oval faces whose schizothyme character is seen in the eyes, although these eyes were painted after death. They are three pictures of mummies¹ which were discovered in the Egyptian province of Fayûm. The first (Illustration 39) shows the typically long oval profile. The second (Illustration 40) shows the short oval, whereas the third (Illustration 41) stands mid-way between the two.

My last illustration (Illustration 42) shows the characteristic profile of a highly interesting woman, *Amalia von Gallitzin*, who was the centre of a circle of scientists and poets at the end of the eighteenth century at Münster (Westphalia). I imagine that a study of her personality from her diaries and letters would confirm the supposition that, in this case, too, the angular profile goes together with a schizothyme disposition. Certain of the more important traits of character of this woman lead us to suppose this to be correct.

I do not doubt for a moment that some of those who observe carefully the plates shown here, and compare them with each other, will have come to the conclusion that although the fundamental difference between the types of physique is clear, there are, nevertheless, obviously many cases in which the peculiarities of the formation are by no means so evident that it may be determined at once if a person belongs to one type or another. If certain of these photographs, in particular some of those in the nude, have led to one of these conclusions, I shall have achieved my

¹ From *Maximilian Ahrem*, "The Woman in the Ancient Art" (Eugen Diedrichs, Jena).

purpose in including them in the book. For I have not only given examples in which the characteristic qualities are emphasized in a striking manner, but also those taken from daily life which, although they belong to a certain group, cannot, nevertheless, be recognized at once as belonging to that group. In fact, it is by no means possible to include everyone in the main group of pycnic or leptosome people; some indeed, not at all, or only after a thorough investigation.

There are various reasons for this. First, as we have mentioned before, the type of the pycnic person often only appears clearly when the person is well advanced into middle age.¹

Again, there are organic peculiarities, quite often disturbances in health (for example, lungs, heart, kidneys, and so on) which we will not consider here more closely. These factors, however, may conceal the specific peculiarities of the conformation of the body, and may also influence the character. There are, finally, small groups of people whose outward appearance shows typical peculiarities, which are the result of some disturbances or other in the function of the hormonal system. *Kretschmer* has distinguished them from his main types by the name of "dysplastic types" (gigantism, cretinism, eunuchoidism, infantilism, and so on). It should be observed that these types, if the disturbance in question is of minor importance, gradually merge into the associated main type, and that both the physical and mental peculiarities, which arise from such mild disturbances, may be of importance in marriage. It is also important that, in certain of these cases, the constitution, and thus both the physique and the character can be transformed by medical treatment, or by surgical action.²

¹ In women also in connection with marriage and pregnancy, which is by no means surprising, as we know that the feminine body in many cases only becomes fully mature under the influence of regular sexual connection, and particularly in pregnancy and childbed. (Through influence of change in the hormonal system, which may also be of great importance as far as the character is concerned.)

² Grafting of ovarian tissue, thyroid gland, treatment, and so on; cf. also in "Ideal Marriage" Chapter VII., the remarks regarding *Steinach's* and *Voronoff's* operations.

There are also certain types which do not appear very often, and which *Kretschmer* himself has not mentioned, particularly, but which have been observed by some of his successors. These sub-types, if I may call them so, are important because they may easily be confused with one of the allied main types, while the character of such a person may be essentially opposed to that of the character found in the main type alluded to. Thus *J. Susman Galant*¹ differentiates the *stenoplastic* constitutional type of woman from the asthenic, and in Part 3 the *euryplastic*² from the athletic.

As far as the character is concerned, the asthenic, as opposed to the stenoplastic woman, shows the following typical qualities: decreased functional power together with increased irritability, timidity and nervousness. She displays a tendency to occupy her thoughts only with her own ego: She suffers from internal discord, weakness of will, apathy and depression. The stenoplastica shows, on the other hand, courageousness and invincible energy, which can make out of her either a charming sunny, life-loving, industrious, companionable woman or the most formidable Xantippe.

Susman Galant's euryplastic type is that of an average athletic woman, with marked but not diseased fat formation, although both physical and mental masculine characteristics of this type are absent. The women who belong to this sub-type are genuine women and good women. They are usually of a happy nature. They do not take life too seriously, and are popular with those around them. They show, however, a certain heaviness and laziness in mind and movement, and the author calls them "elephant natures."

I do not find it possible, however (even, although I know that I thus oppose the views of the author) to see more in this type than a transitional or mixed form between the

¹ In the "Archives for Gynecology and Constitutional Research," Vol. 12, Parts II. and III. (Kabitzsch, Leipzig, 1926).

² *Etpús*—broad, stout. How easily confusion and misunderstanding may arise in regard to the theory of the constitution, is shown by the fact that this word is employed in another work to describe the *pycnic* type (*Bunack*).

asthenic and the pycnic, or between the athletic and the pycnic type, which is true both of the external appearance as also of the psychic constitution. I have come to this conclusion not only through the study of *Galant's* essays themselves, but also as the result of observation of some of the individuals belonging to these transitional groups.

It is obvious that there must be numerous stages between the main groups. The constitution is determined chiefly by heredity. Inter-breeding between individuals belonging to the various groups often takes place. Nature desires the normal to a certain extent, even the average, and endeavours at all costs to balance the extremes. There is no reason, therefore, for surprise at the large number of mixed forms. It is, however, just as much in the nature of things that, in addition to the levelling principle, Nature endeavours to preserve the main peculiarities of the types. (Compare the information in regard to research into heredity previously mentioned.)

And so we observe, in addition to the transitional and mixed forms, the characteristics of one or the other main groups holding their place. In other words, in the great majority of cases, the hereditary factors, which produce the more marked types, dominate.

Nevertheless, the mixed forms between the pycnic and the leptosome type are more often the cause of difficulties in the diagnosis of the physique than are *Susman Galant's* sub- or transitional types mentioned above. This is so if we encounter these mixed forms, of pycnic and leptosome build in the "average type" (which is, to some extent, "the ideal human form"). We also meet with these difficulties in those cases in which we have to judge a body which shows certain characteristics of one of the main types and some of the other. I have already drawn attention to these two kinds of mixed forms and have emphasized that the one last mentioned is very often met with both in daily life, in sculpture and in painting. It is obvious that the diagnosis of the formation of a body is made more difficult when deformities, for example, rickets, are present. For the

sake of completeness, we must mention the influence which race has on the body, since this also may cause difficulty in judging the type.

Finally, inexperienced people can be deceived in such questions by fashion. If, as was it in *Botticelli's* time, and is now the case, the asthenic figure is the dominant fashion, we observe that attempts are made not only to make the body appear as tall and thin as possible, but to copy the characteristic asthenic attitude. Quite often, for instance, we see on the stage how a well built, typical pycnic woman, who has to represent a cyclothyme person, appears in a masculine make-up and takes on asthenic poses, which shows that the actress, although she knows what is the fashion, has no idea of characterization. Those who have a certain insight into these things, will not be able to repress a somewhat malicious smile when they observe how many healthy pycnic-cyclothyme girls make themselves out to be asthenic to the men with whom they come in contact, and thus give them a much worse idea with regard to the consequence of marriage with them, than is actually the case.

There are, therefore, many circumstances which prejudice the possibility of an accurate diagnosis of the body. In addition, there can be no question of a *scientific* diagnosis without a thorough observation and measurement of the naked body.

In spite of this, the expert can, as a general rule, gain a correct impression of the type of physique met with in a certain person in a relatively large number of cases, without observation of the naked body. Those who have a talent for this can fairly soon, without any particular practice, learn to distinguish between a pycnic, an asthenic, an athletic or a leptosome figure which does not belong to these two extremes. Thus, there is always some possibility of judging the general nature of the character, although it must not be forgotten that the mixed and transitional forms between the types are expressed (or may be) by peculiarities of character. Thus, to mention one of the many possibilities of this nature, mental qualities determined by cyclothyme hereditary

factors may be combined with a physique owing its origin to schizothyme-leptosome ancestors. It would, therefore, be extremely hazardous to try to make an accurate judgment of the nature of a person by observation *alone*. Nevertheless, since *Kretschmer* and his successors have added to science the facts mentioned above, this observation, combined with impressions received directly, may inform us, in certain cases, if we are in the presence of a schizothyme or cyclothyme person.

And, having proceeded so far, it is often possible to reach a more thorough determination by direct impressions, and, if necessary, by indirect impressions received in another manner; that is to say, to determine with a degree of probability, to which group of schizothyme or cyclothyme (see beginning of this chapter), the person undergoing the experiment belongs.

Should a pycnic-cyclothyme or leptosome schizothyme husband or wife be chosen? It is highly probable that many will ask themselves this question.

But, it is also obvious that an absolute answer to such a question cannot be given. This depends on the character of the man or woman making the choice, and on what is expected from that choice. While one desires a peaceful life beside a syntonic, harmonious companion, another would prefer to choose the "interesting" complicated person, whom he can help in the solution of dissonances. One person likes a melodious allegro-moderato, the other a vivace, rich in changes, in tone and rhythm which sometimes gives him unexpected and strange sensations. One man does not wish to make his task unnecessarily difficult, whereas another enjoys solving problems, and it must not be forgotten that, whereas the one seeks—I confine myself here to extremes—in his partner in marriage, in addition to the satisfaction of his erotic and gregarious instincts, the fulfilment of his wish for close communion in every sense of the word, the other only desires to satisfy his vanity, particularly in that he desires to show off his wife.

I purposely state here, in contrast to the above, in which I have been dealing with both man and woman, "that he desires to show off his wife," because this method of satisfying vanity is principally a masculine quality; indeed, in certain countries, and in certain classes of society of a great number of men.

Such men, when they wish to marry, look for a schizothyme-leptosome woman. They do this unconsciously or consciously, but, in the latter case, mostly without anticipating the scope of their decision. *Mathes* calls this type of woman "inter-sexual" because the schizothyme-leptosome is, to a large extent masculine, and because the women who belong to this group show, in many respects, too many masculine and too few feminine qualities (in particular, in regard to their sexual functions); "the inter-sexual woman fires a person and blinds him." She can be, if she is not in the most extreme wing of this main group and has the necessary particular qualifications, a "striking" and an "interesting" woman.

It is much less easy for the girl with a pycnic-cyclothyme disposition, unless, in the course of years, circumstances cause her to go in that direction.

This is not in the nature of the pycnic woman. Her object is to be a woman, only a woman and entirely a woman. The syntonic-pycnic woman understands how to make both a schizothyme and a cyclothyme man happy. It is her nature to seek and find her happiness in looking after her husband and children, even although this nature may be suppressed by the influence of the environment in which she lives. She detests dramatic scenes. She takes the difficulties that come with life, without excitement or anxiety, for no more than they really are, and she understands how to enjoy both the great and the small, simple pleasures of life.

She is not complicated, and is natural in her sexual life. Her lack of feeling in the beginning (physiological and relative) are easily overcome, and, further, she proves to be an excellent pupil in practical erotics and is an ideal partner

for a normally feeling husband. Her claims in this respect are not too high if their fulfilment, either permanently or from time to time, is too difficult. On the other hand, she understands how to adapt herself cheerfully to a greater sexual desire on the part of her husband. The most important point is, however, that the pycnic woman has harmonious sexual life, both from the physiological and mental point of view.

In contrast to this, there are often internal disproportions to be found in the woman of schizothyme-leptosome type, and she inclines to one extreme or the other. Abnormal frigidity, or insatiableness and a tendency to seek her sexual satisfaction otherwise than by the natural way, is common with her. Equally doubtful from the point of view of married happiness, is the fact that the inter-sexual woman, with her inharmonious mind, very often tries to live with her husband on a "high plane of mental sympathy" to the exclusion of the sexual connection, which she considers "animal." Often the mental aspirations of the schizothyme woman are far beyond her mental qualities, and thus internal and external conflicts may easily occur. The "misunderstood" belong largely to this type. The psychotherapeutic physician knows that the majority of his patients belong to the inter-sexual group of women, or are really asthenic. The gynæcologist knows this too, as he has to treat such women both for anatomical and functional disturbances in the development of the sexual organs, and also for local abdominal complaints which are only disturbances of the mental balance projected into the genital sphere.

We have not enough space to compare the various types of women with each other in detail. What has already been stated has given us some impression of what would be said if we proceeded to make a comparative examination. To put it briefly, we shall complete the quotation cited above from *Mathes'* monograph, "the inter-sexual fires and blinds, a pycnic woman warms." In agreement with *Wilhelm Liepmann*, whom I have followed to some extent with regard to this matter, we may quote the fact that

Goethe "fled from the schizothyme Charlotte into the arms of the cyclothyme Christiane."¹

About these two types, opinions may differ according to preference, but it is certain that a man will have a much easier marriage with a pycnic-syntonic than with a schizothyme woman.²

As far as man is concerned, it cannot be said that "THE" masculine character is only met with in the schizothyme type, although it is true that the great majority of men have certain characteristics of this group. The cyclothyme man can also be a real and typical man. Whether he is to be recommended as a candidate for marriage depends generally more on his purely personal qualities than on the fact that he belongs to one or the other of the main types. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the syntonic man is likely to be the cause of fewer quarrels in marriage and himself finds less reason to pick such quarrels.

It is usually wrong to generalize, but it is necessary in order to make the main facts clear. With this premise, we may state the following with regard to the prospects of success in marriage of the representatives of the two main types:

I. As a general rule, a syntonic man and a syntonic woman will get on well with each other, particularly if, in spite of this, their characters show enough variation. They are likely to bore each other if this is not the case.

II. The normal marriage is, to a certain extent, that of a cyclothyme-pycnic woman and a schizothyme-leptosome

¹ "Gynæcological Psychotherapy," pp. 108-109 (Urban & Schwarzenberg, Vienna, 1924).

² Compare the angular profile of Frau von Stein's self-portrait, the original of which is in Kochberg Castle, and a reproduction is given on p. 320 of *Wilhelm Bode's* "Charlotte von Stein" (Mittler & Sons, Berlin, 1912), with the typically pycnic face and the rather thick-set figure of Christiane Vulpius, after the water colour "Christiane and August," by *Heinrich Meyer*, in the Goethe National Museum, which is also reproduced on p. 390 of the same book.

It should be observed that, if we compare the two feminine main types, together, the pycnic-cyclothyme type will practically never be preferred. If a fair comparison is to be made, people from the same class and circumstances of life should be chosen . . . And even then ? . . .

man. This "normal" marriage is, therefore, a marriage of contrast. Considered from the eugenic point of view, it should be an excellent thing for two reasons: that a good average in regard to the children may be expected, if no particularly unfavourable influences enter into the matter, and further that there is a chance that exceptional people will be born of the marriage.¹ The chances for the personal happiness of the partners may be considered good provided that the contrast is not too marked—in other words, if both belong to the average of the main group. In addition to this, they must have goodwill and the self-control to put this goodwill into practice, and the personal qualities must be capable of assimilation.

III. Marriages of contrast in the opposite sense are those between cyclothyme men and schizothyme women. The prospects of difficulties are here much greater. The patience, long suffering and self-control of the man will be put to a great test in many such marriages. A syntonic character, however, makes it possible in the long run for the husband, if circumstances are favourable, to save the situation.

F.M. marriages must be specially mentioned here. They are so called because the F. (feminine) is in these cases stronger than the M. (masculine) in that the woman's mental character predominates over that of the man. If the cyclothyme husband—either because he wants peace or because his brain is entirely concentrated on other things, or because he values and chooses his wife because of her motherliness, or also because he is of a particularly feminine disposition—is entirely satisfied with such a relationship, and the wife finds sufficient compensation in such a marriage for what she must of necessity lose, then such a marriage may not only be successful, but happy, although it must be taken into consideration that such married happiness must be judged by another standard than "normal marriage." Not only are those who have studied such relationships, agreed that F.M. marriages

¹ *Goethe* was born of such a marriage.

are fairly common, and that they are often fairly successful, but we know of famous marriages of this type.¹

It is certain that, to bring about and to maintain such married happiness, the presence of favourable personal qualities is not enough. In addition, the characters must agree with one another in that the feminine surplus in the man is compensated for by the more than usual masculine qualities of the woman. It is, naturally, also possible that such compensating qualities develop in one of the partners only during the marriage. This is a matter of adaptability.

IV. Finally, marriage between two schizothyme types. It may be an ideal marriage and may remain so. But this is a very great exception. Generally speaking, even in the average persons of this type, the prospects are not favourable—not to speak of the extreme cases. It is just as well that, when an exceptionally good-looking betrothed couple (for well-built leptosomes are very often good looking) are seen, that one usually does not think of the great difficulties these people will have to make their marriage happy and to maintain this happiness.

We have observed from what we have already said, that the conformation of the body in general, from which the type of person may be recognized, is also expressed in the details of various parts of the body. To mention certain examples, to which we have drawn attention, the (relative) length or shortness of the arms, the shape of the hands and of the head.

¹ An excellent example of this is the happy marriage of *Robert and Clara Schumann*. This does not mean that *Clara Schumann* was the absolute type of the schizothyme leptosome woman. But, in her marriage, she usually took the more masculine active part, while her husband's disposition was extremely cycloid, and his character was more feminine. It is well known that *Robert Schumann's* face displayed such qualities. The earlier pictures of his wife are by no means so characteristic. Nevertheless, there is a picture of *Clara Schumann* in *Emil Peter's* book, p. 239, "The Human Form and Character" (Volkskraftverlag, Constance, 1923), when she was older, which shows the masculine character of her even then very beautiful features.

Just as the masses of the people in general, by reason of intuition and experience and in accordance with the feelings of the greatest men, have always accepted the existence of a correspondence between the general conformation of the body and the character, so men have always been convinced that there is a connection between the shape of certain parts of the body and the personal peculiarities of the individual. Thus, physiognomy, the art of reaching conclusions about the nature of mental qualities of a person by means of the observation of the shape of the body and its external parts and, in particular, of the formation of the face (physiognomy) was, even in ancient times, widely practised. To prove this, we need only mention the names of *Socrates*, *Plato* and *Aristotle*, who were well known to be believers in these views. After this theory had reappeared in the course of centuries in various forms, it became widely known with the publication of *Lavater's* "Physiognomic Fragments for the Propagation of Human Knowledge and Philanthropy" (Leipzig, 1775-1778). *Lavater* found a number of important people to support him—to begin with, even *Goethe* and his friends. But he also encountered strong and indeed violent opposition—we can now say, naturally and rightly, for his views were based rather on intuitive talent than on objective and reasoned observation. Therefore, *Lavater's* physiognomic system was entirely abandoned by the scientific world in the course of time.

But, the age-old idea, that particular states of mind and certain physical qualities, were shown in corresponding features, still remained, and was *bound* to remain because experience showed that it occurred again and again. It was kept alive by the people and also by physicians. Since the time of *Hippocrates*, we term the aspect of the features of the dying, with their sunken temples and the clearly prominent nose and chin portions "*facies Hippocratica*": and the expression "*facies . . . (abdominalis, ovarica, etc. . . .)*" is just as generally met with as the typical features of those who are suffering from Graves' disease, *Melancholia*, etc.

Pregnancy too (a physiological process) often involves

a fairly characteristic change in the facial form and expression, and, at all events, is recognized by experts, at the first glance.

These remarks have already led us, to some extent, into another field of observation, no less interesting, where looks are no longer dependent exclusively on the anatomical formation, but on the movement of expression of the muscles. We have learned that we may observe correlation with the character in the conformation of the body and its parts, because both are determined by the constitution ; and mime (the changing expression of the face occasioned by muscular action) and pantomime (expressive movements of the body) generally give us a faithful reflection of mental processes, so that the character of a person (or, at any rate, the presence of certain traits and the existence of certain emotions), need not be judged only in the way we have just mentioned, that is to say, by the conformation of the body and its parts, but also by the movements of expression.

This has been attempted again and again, and those who have written on the subject are people of undoubted importance, such as *Petrus Camper*, *Charles Bell*, *Baumgärtner*, *Morison*, *Carus*, *Darwin*, *Piderit*, *Duchenne*, *Mantegazza*, and others. Nevertheless, particularly in scientific circles, no value is now attached to such conclusions. The reason for this is that, apart from the inevitable reaction to the more or less ridiculous way in which such investigations are only too often acclaimed, mimic and pantomimic movements can be controlled, to a great extent, and purposely altered by people who have the will-power and practice. So that there is a risk of being influenced by movements of expression which are not spontaneous, but which are voluntarily produced. Thus, false conclusions are reached.

Nevertheless, both the study of personal characteristics shown by the formation of various parts of the body, and individual peculiarities of movement, supply valuable data in regard to the investigation of character. Therefore, the rehabilitation of characterology in our times, which has

led to greatly increased attention being paid to this branch of research is to be welcomed. It must not, however, be forgotten in this connection, that it is particularly difficult, in certain of these special studies, to remove the conscious or unconscious fancies of untold centuries. Attempts at progress in this field can only be undertaken with the greatest caution and reserve, and any kind of imaginative speculation must be rigorously excluded. Thus, we are in the very elementary stages of *knowledge* of this question.

For this reason, I am of the opinion that only very few people (who are specially talented in this respect and who, apart from this, have made serious research work in this field ; who possess great experience which has been critically applied and are aware of the great responsibility entailed) should be allowed to give judgments on character, which are based on special investigations (for example, physiognomy, cheirology—the science of the lines and formation of the hands, not to be confused with cheiromancy—telling fortunes by the hand). I am convinced that, of the relatively numerous people who feel that they have a vocation for this, not to speak of the many persons who pretend that they have this vocation, only a few are chosen, and that it will be a long time before auxiliary sciences of this nature can aspire to be termed real sciences, and can be employed to help in regard to the judging of character. For this reason, I believe that one can only make use of these auxiliary sciences in the most exceptional circumstances as far as choice in marriage is concerned. I must emphatically advise against their amateur employment in regard to this choice and in regard to marriage in general.

It is a different matter with *Graphology*.

The principal reason for this is that the science of handwriting has progressed greatly owing to the ideas of such men as *Adolf Henze*, *J. H. Michon*, *Crépieux-Jamin*, *W. Langenbruch* and *Wilhelm Preyer*, with the co-operation of *Georg Meyer*, *Hans Busse* and *Ludwig Klages*. Thus,

principally owing to the work of *Ludwig Klages*,¹ graphology has become a genuine science based on secure foundations, associated with the science of the expression of movement.

Its practical application, however, is by no means easy, because it is not only a science, but also an art. In other words, in order to be able to indicate a person's character successfully from his handwriting, not only acquired knowledge but talent as well is necessary; not only knowledge but insight too, not only an excellent primary brain capacity but also a receptive secondary function for such things.

Apart from this, it must be performed here, as in all such branches with the previous condition of absolute trustworthiness and a deep sense of responsibility.

It is clear that there are only a *few* people capable of carrying out so hard a task, and it is not surprising that, as people (educated people excepted least of all) are always credulous and superstitious, an enormous number of charlatans are doing this work. An idea of the high demands made regarding the education of handwriting experts, and of the conditions and points of dispute in practical graphology can be gained in *Klages'* monograph, "The Theory and Practice of the Comparison of Handwriting in the Law

¹ A short survey of the history of graphology may be found at the end of *Klages'* book, "Handwriting and Character, a popular summary of graphological technique" (Barth, Leipzig, 1926). This book deals, as its title denotes, principally with technical and practical problems, while his work "The Expression of Movement and Power of Delineation, the Foundations of the Science of Expression" (Joh. A. Barth, Leipzig, 1923) is purely scientific and deals with graphology as part of the general theory of the expression of the disposition. *Herbert Gerstner's* "Text-book of Graphology" (Niels-Kampmann & Co., Heidelberg) may be read preparatory to the study of the first-mentioned book; and, to complete the study, particularly in regard to the peculiarities in the handwriting of young people, *Minna Becker's* book, "The Graphology of Children's Handwriting," published by the same firm, may be recommended. *Wilhelm Preyer's* book, "The Psychology of Writing," was published as long ago as 1895, but has been reissued unaltered recently, and is indispensable for the scientific student, although the matter contained in it, as is observed by *Klages*, does not approach the present standard of knowledge. Analysis of handwriting, both in accordance with the manner adopted by *Kräpelin* ("The Comparison of Handwriting"), and *Klages* ("Direct Analysis of the Handwriting Duct") will repay study. Relations between the formation of the body, temperament and handwriting, which appear to exist, according to *Harrer* and *Iselin*, will be of service in classifying handwriting.

Courts," in the *Anthropological Review* (also in a special edition published by Niels-Kampmann). It would be a great step forward if the anarchy existing in professional graphology were put to an end by handwriting experts themselves, if possible, with the aid of the State, so that those who wish to have their own or someone else's character explained by this science, may be more certain than is now the case, that such an explanation will be given by an expert worthy of the great trust that is laid upon him.

I am pleased to hear that a small number of men and women, chosen by *Klages* himself, are being educated on broad lines in graphology.

All who wish to gain information about graphological science are recommended to be certain that they obtain such information only from those who are fitted to give it.

A second reason why we can learn more of the character of a person from handwriting than we can from other movements of expression and their permanent results, lies in the fact that it is far more difficult (and is, indeed, usually absolutely impossible) to alter and to conceal in writing, natural movements, and thus the characteristics of the handwriting, in such a way that an expert judge is unable to draw correct conclusions regarding the character of the writer. The proofs contained in Chapter IX. of "Handwriting and Character," mentioned above, are entirely convincing. There is no doubt that writing can be purposely altered. But this does not remove the possibility of discovering the particular characteristics in spite of this, and thus of indicating the character of the writer. Graphological science has means of separating the acquired from the original traits. Methods which can be employed both in those cases in which the writing has only been altered temporarily (purposely altered writing) and also if the original writing has undergone a definite change (acquired handwriting).

It is obvious that such alterations are of importance in themselves, because the mental influences which have brought them about can thus be ascertained. Apart from this, it is

clear, from the few words that we have said here, how necessary it is to submit to the graphologist not only a few lines of handwriting for his opinion, but a more or less detailed letter or manuscript—if possible, a letter written when the writer did not think of the way in which he was writing it because he was completely absorbed in what he had to set down.¹ If graphology, therefore, gives, by reason of the very important differences we have mentioned, which separate it from other characterological auxiliary sciences (which, it should be repeated, are not yet sciences at all!), every ground for abandoning, to some extent, that caution with which we approach other auxiliary sciences, it also affords us the opportunity of obtaining, in addition to a general impression of the character of the writer, information in regard to certain particular characteristics. Thus, it is not only possible, by reason of this information, to obtain the confirmation (or denial) of conclusions with regard to character which we have gathered from observation of the conformation of the body of a person, but also, in cases where such observation has left us in doubt, we may obtain information by graphological methods, if the person undergoing the experiment belongs to the main group of cyclothymes or schizothymes. Further, we can, by means of analysis of the writing, obtain special data with regard to proceeding peculiarities than we could obtain indirectly; from the conformation of the body—physical constitution—mental constitution—and, finally, to character. Thus graphological data may supplement the information we have gained from the conformation of the body.

¹ It is also necessary, if writing is submitted for an opinion regarding the character of the writer, to state if it has been written by a man or woman. But, I think it is desirable to give a few other facts in regard to the circumstances of the writer: for example, age and profession. If the capacity of the graphologist does not need to be tested, there is nothing against giving such information. No graphological information with regard to a character should be asked for without a valid reason. Neither should there be insufficient confidence in the capacity of the person employed. If we are certain of these capacities, and there is no intention of putting him to the test, why should not his task be made as simple as possible, thereby increasing the prospects of receiving correct information?

In a rational marriage choice, people will be more likely to endeavour to obtain information from graphology if the initial impression made by the character of the partner under consideration, leaves doubts as to the prospects of an alliance with him or her.

It is superfluous to mention again that, for the appreciation of these prospects, *self-knowledge* is essential. But I must add that a thorough study of an opinion regarding one's own handwriting may contribute much to such knowledge.

If a prospective husband or wife desire really to obtain advantages from an expert analysis of the handwriting of his or her possible partner, they should thoroughly study the report they have received, reflect upon it, and *themselves* compare the two characters with each other. By this means, they will obtain not only a certain insight into the possibilities of a favourable outcome of the marriage but increase the possibilities, because the deeper insight gained in this way into their own personality and into the personalities of each other, is most favourable to mutual understanding and mutual adaptability in the marriage.

For this reason I cannot agree with the method employed in graphological practice regarding the characterological interpretation of the handwriting of prospective married couples. This method consists in studying by comparative analysis both the handwritings and pronouncing an opinion as to whether they will or will not harmonize with each other making this a prognosis in regard to the marriage.

Apart from the fact that it is too great a risk (even if the expert knows both the characters far more thoroughly than could ever be the case by means of the interpretation of handwriting) to give a prognosis of the marriage, it is, in my opinion, far better to give entirely separate analyses of both the handwritings. In such cases, however, chiefly those qualities of character should be taken into consideration which are of more than usual importance for the marriage, and equally such that the person particularly desires to be explained. The graphologist can, if he is asked, add a short statement to the two separate analyses in which

the characters of the prospective couple, in so far as their qualities have been made plain by an investigation of their handwritings, are broadly compared with each other. The purpose of this explanation must be to give the questioner and his advisers (for example, the parents), an opportunity of reflecting over the contents of the report, and to make it possible for them to draw conclusions from it. From this point of view, therefore, such a supplementary report is desirable.

The graphologist goes too far, in my opinion, if he does the work of comparison, reflection and deduction and puts before them a completed conclusion, instead of allowing the prospective pair to do this for themselves.

The method of submitting to the questioner not merely facts about character resulting from graphological analyses, from which he can draw his own conclusions, but in addition allowing the graphologist to draw up a complete conclusion, may have its advantages if the object of the investigation is to determine the suitability of a person for a certain position (although even then its usefulness is open to doubt). But when it is a matter of taking such an important decision affecting once and for all the whole future life, the graphologist should take on no responsibility he *need* not bear and indeed *cannot* bear, and he must impress on the two people that they are responsible for any steps they may subsequently take. This can only have a good effect, since it forces them seriously to think over the matter for themselves.

If the two specimens of handwriting come from a married couple whose choice is no longer open, the graphologist must be particularly careful in coming to any conclusions. For a suggestion made in his written statement that their characters will not harmonize can only have a most unfavourable influence on the relationship between husband and wife. Therefore, I hold it to be a fundamental error to send in specimens of handwriting without mentioning the fact that the persons in question are married to one another.

Some may reply to this, that they will not receive a purely objective judgment and that this is what they most desire to have. I will make no definite objection to their remarks,

except that they should give up the idea of a comparative final consideration. Better still, they should send in the specimens separately asking for a thorough graphological analysis of both, without mentioning the relationship.

Apart from this, I am convinced that a graphologist who has talent for, and has been trained in psychology, can do a great deal of good by giving a comprehensive statement, based on the analysis of the handwriting of a married couple, if he has the tact to bring out the binding factors and the still greater tact to indicate those points in which the married couple must be indulgent to, or must support and guide one another.

I know how high are the demands thus made not only on the knowledge and talent of the graphologist, but also on his character. But I am equally certain that an opinion and advice, which may be of such far-reaching importance, should only be asked of those who comply with these high demands.

I must again utter a warning against irresponsibility, both as far as questioning and the giving of graphological decisions are concerned.

I made a remark above of the very greatest importance without drawing particular attention to it.

I spoke of those qualities of character, "that are of more than usual importance in marriage." Certain things may be said against this from a scientific and psychological point of view.

Let us pass over such doubts and we are faced with the question as to whether *all* traits of character, as a result of the presence at the same time of other qualities (in one or other of the partners) may not be of supreme importance. This question must be answered in the affirmative. We should further realize that there are absolutely no scientific data regarding the connection between certain traits of character in husband and wife and the harmony or happiness of the marriage, and that a great deal of work, taking much time, will have to be accomplished, before we shall be in possession of such data.

Finally, is it at all possible to estimate the importance

of certain traits of character for marriage? Let us choose a quality which may quite well be expressed in the handwriting: adaptability. It is clear, that a person, desirous of contracting a marriage, will consider this to be a favourable quality, facilitating the maintenance of harmony in the marriage and diminishing the number of disputes.

But, in contradiction to this, it may be said (as was actually done by a psychologist with whom I corresponded on the subject) that the quality above-mentioned, if it is sufficiently well defined, may lead to vacillation, instability, and weakness—traits of character which are most certainly not favourable to the success of the marriage.

This question might be discussed for a long time, and an equally long period might be spent in discussing the value of other qualities for marriage. Qualities, too, apart from their relativity, have a certain ambivalence (having both a positive and negative effect) which appears particularly in connection with changes in circumstances.¹ A favourable quality in one person may be unfavourable in another. What one person may think favourable in another, the other may think unfavourable in him (or in a third person). A good quality for a general may be a bad one for a clergyman, and one which may please the man in his wife may appear unpleasing to her if he possesses it.

I shall therefore take good care not to draw up a list in which the qualities of character of the man and the woman are termed "favourable" or "unfavourable" for marriage, and classified according to this plan.

I will be still more careful of saying: "I advise marriage with a woman possessing *this* quality or with a man possessing *that*."

"One rule does not apply to all! Each must do what suits him best."

This does not mean that it may not be of advantage to draw the attention of those who have to consider a graphological report for the purpose of selection in marriage, to the importance of the following qualities (to their presence or

¹ It is self-evident that in estimating a quality it will be seen to become its opposite (as in the above example) if there is excess of this quality.

absence and tendency) all of which may be expressed in handwriting :

Nature and direction of the erotic disposition. Preponderantly cyclothyme or preponderantly schizothyme.

Gregarious sense and desire ; goodwill.

Adaptable or self-willed.

Mainly active or inclined to be passive.

Independent or requiring support ; ready to, and capable of leading or obedient.

Desirous of having power or of submitting to the sway of others (self-subordination).

Faithful (generally speaking, not only purely married sexual fidelity) ; inconstant or steadfast in affections.

Reliable or unreliable.

Ideas of life based on " work " or on " pleasure."

Denying or affirming life ; cheerful, or inclined to melancholy.

Dominance of the primary, or of the secondary cerebral functions.

Ego-centric or altero-centric ; egotistic or altruistic ; thinking subjectively or objectively.

Excessive, normal, or small emotional capacity ; capable of suggestion ; impulsiveness ; emotional.

Hypersensitive, normally sensitive or insensitive.

Motherliness ; devotion.

Constant or inconstant.

Aggressive or avoiding difficulties.

Strong or weak in character.

Controlled or uncontrolled.

Healthy self-respect, overbearing, or lack of self-confidence.

Conciliatory or incompatible ; resentful ; soon in a good temper again after a dispute, or sulky.

Harmonious or inharmonious.

Easy or hard to get on with.

Even tempered or moody.

Tactful or inconsiderate.

Healthy sense of humour and inclination to regard oneself from a slightly ironical point of view, or ironically offensive and unpleasantly sarcastic to others.

Content with himself and his lot, or internally discontented and at war with himself.

Further, briefly: charming or brusque, even crude and brutal; kind or harsh to subordinates; sympathetic and ready to help, or cruel; patient or impatient; gentle or severe and sharp; modest or pretentious; considerate or censorious; industrious and diligent or lazy; calm or violent, passionate; irritable or apathetic; thrifty, niggardly, or extravagant; honourable, sincere, truth-loving, or insincere, deceitful, suspicious.

Other qualities.—Religious sense, idealistic, general moral feeling; level of intelligence and education; taste, attitude to art; special talents.

Others (more or less at random).—Thorough, superficial; methodical, careful and prudent, punctual—negligent, hasty, rash; persistent, efficient, making the most of opportunities—acting in a vacillating manner, feeble; definite in views—irresolute; enthusiastic—indifferent; companionable—reserved; feeling of responsibility, sense of duty, circumspection, endurance, steadfastness, obstinacy, ambition, versatile, having initiative, a critical mind—or the opposite.

Finally, such qualities as: envious, jealous (exceeding normal love jealousy), immoderately egotistic, sensual, imperious, obstinate; dominated by impulses and passions; inclined to exaggeration and excess in all things. Thus qualities that are the transition stage between actual defects of character and morbid conditions.

It would lead us too far if we proceeded to the consideration of the *defects* of character—however important this may be sometimes in marriage relationships.

I therefore only mention that graphology can give important hints in this respect; that symptoms pointing to neurotic disturbances are worthy of special attention, and that it is of the greatest importance to be able to recognize a hysterical mentality or personality.

I have not attempted to achieve completeness in the foregoing list, and still less have I tried to anticipate the results which it is hoped will be achieved by scientific investigation in the course of time.

I merely wished to give hints and suggestions which might be helpful to the reader in his considerations.

In this way I believe my explanations will have been of use, because the reflections they should inspire may be of no small service to the reader in attaining and maintaining that married harmony which is an indispensable condition of permanent happiness.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER XIII.

To give my readers an impression of what can be done in marriage by graphology to show them what a good analysis looks like, and what may or may not be expected from it, I add below a graphological report dealing with two people, and a final statement, drawn up according to the principles above mentioned.

The analysis was performed by an expert of the "Cornelius" Graphological Institute in Munich, which, through the friendly offices of Dr. *Hans v. Hattingberg* and *Niels Kampmann*, the editors of the *Anthropological Review*, Berlin, consented to give its co-operation.

The only difference between this report and a normal one drawn according to the principles laid down is that the expert, at my request, has added certain explanations to enable my readers to gain an insight (though of necessity only a very limited insight) into the particular points and considerations which lead the graphologist to his deductions.

ANALYSIS

The Man.—Although not absolutely an unique personality, he has sufficient originality and has a many-sided and interesting character.

Versatile; the general impression is genial; he is receptive but can equally maintain his own point of view and desires to do this. He is of sanguine temperament; quick at making a decision, he is less quick in action. His ideas come suddenly and unexpectedly, he is cheerful and optimistic; he is more enthusiastic than intensive in his feelings and experiences. Thus less constant, always changing, also in his attitude to those about him. Very adaptable but not always very willing to adapt himself, very charming indeed, when he must or when he is in the mood; inconsiderate and imperious if he feels he is being thwarted or that his advantage is at stake. General level of intelligence excellent; feels for all things good and true, that make all the more impression on him as he feels he does not conform to this ideal himself.

Has an artistic nature and a practical mind, but is really neither an artist nor a practical man.

This forms the periphery of the character and must now be filled in, proceeding outwards from the centre. This centre (the *basic* constitution) is formed by a direct unity of receptivity and desire for

expression. His receptivity is entirely genuine and is primarily determined by *things* (these will be enumerated later).

He can become genuinely ecstatic about certain beautiful things and possibilities, and in this side of his character he borders almost on the mystic. The difference here is, however, his equally centralised need for expression. He cannot keep his intuitions to himself, he must share them with others and convey them to others in eloquent words and suggestions; he must have an effect on others. Thus, strictly speaking, he never enjoys anything alone, but always puts himself in the place of others in order to be able to influence them.

His greatest enthusiasm is always aroused by something that makes it possible for him to expand, to influence other people. He is also particularly fond of making small things appear extraordinary and of treating great matters as insignificant trifles. In him the spirit of contradiction is always at work.⁽⁹⁾¹

His capacities are equal to the demand made upon them: he can make direct use of his personality, can easily "get away from himself"; all the expressions of his ego are the result of a powerful organic superfluity and do not appear disjointed and unharmonious.⁽¹⁾

It is apparent from this, that the writer is not to any great extent a man of endurance, determination, or work, nor is he strict with himself.

He creates in the first flush of enthusiasm; he can conquer in a rush, but he is less capable of holding what he has won.⁽²⁾

He creates in genial first impulses but readily leaves the execution to others.

He has no principles that he would not abandon owing to his inconsistency.⁽³⁾ He is not industrious, not hard on himself, and not steadfast in the face of opposition.⁽⁴⁾

But he is not the reverse of all this. It cannot be said that his life, while it is not exactly based on work—is given up to pleasure. This artistic nature must be judged by other standards. He is creative through and through, and to be actively creative is, to him, work and pleasure combined.⁽⁵⁾

This does not prevent him from appearing, to an austere and hard person, as a man who neglects himself somewhat, who is rather feminine, and, indeed, superficial in his attitude to serious things. To such a person he would seem to be frivolous and sometimes irresponsible; finally very self-centred, almost egotistic and always thinking of his own advantage. In spite of this—he is never only material and brutally sensual. He is too intellectual for this.⁽⁶⁾

He enjoys everything with his senses to the highest degree, but he is hardly at all sensual in the narrower meaning of the word.

First and foremost he sees the beauties of the world through the eye.⁽⁷⁾ He prefers plastic art, beautiful interiors, colours,⁽⁸⁾ flowers, and nature. He has not special talent for music, but enjoys it, for his whole being can be termed "musical" up to a certain point. His mind is most in harmony with poetry. And although he is, not a real artist⁽⁹⁾ in any of these things, he has a true poetical nature and this is shown even in his conversation. But he is equally a practical man.

¹ See pp. 248 to 249.

1 Liebes Fräulein

2 Ich sende Ihnen einen recht
3 herzlichsten Gruß und
4 sehr für Ihren Brief.
5 Heute kann ich Ihnen nicht
6 schreiben, da ich noch einen so
7 großen für Sie gefunden habe.
8 Ich brauche ihn aber mehr,
9 leider war (übrigens nicht mit mir
10 Abends nach dem Früh an Sie

1 Ich habe Sie von Ihrem kleinen
2 Herrn Knecht, ich habe mich sehr herzlich für Sie
3 gefreut und würde Ihnen das heute mit
4 dem herzlichsten Wünschen für den kleinen
5 sagen. Wie geht es Ihnen dem Prinzen aus

He does not care much for "pure" art; everything, to please him, must be "applied." He must have realities before him, and he can accept these realities and use them from the practical point of view. He has a healthy and quick understanding, great practical and administrative gifts,⁽¹⁰⁾ and sufficient self-reliance never to act contrary to his own interests. These qualities make him not only a born organizer and promoter of undertakings, but also a most "efficient" person.⁽¹¹⁾

Not only does he desire to impress his equals, but he likes to have subordinates under his orders and to command them according to his good pleasure. He particularly enjoys considering all sorts of different matters⁽¹²⁾ together and in business, in combining the most varied aspects of a problem and arriving at a successful solution.

In his intercourse with people he will at one time treat his employes as artists and equals, and "in flattering them" feels himself flattered.

At another time he will treat highly placed persons, either to surprise them or because of some opposition, inconsiderately and imperiously.⁽¹³⁾

As far as his own interests are concerned, although they are never alone authoritative, and he often goes contrary to them by extravagance, making presents and other inconsistencies, he never leaves them out of account or really acts against them. Thus he can treat the same person in an entirely different manner, depending as to whether he is dealing with him in business or as a friend. He is sometimes very charming and sometimes inconsiderate even outwardly, according to the matter in hand or the mood he is in at the time.

On the other hand he is fundamentally cordial, human, kind and devoted⁽¹⁴⁾, and his intelligence and taste are out of the ordinary.⁽¹⁵⁾ He could not, however, be said to be exactly ethically inclined, nor hard, nor thick-blooded, but these qualities are present in a high degree in his wife.

The Wife appears, in fact, to be the exact opposite of her husband. He is versatile, she is reserved and single-minded, his character is primarily æsthetic while hers is definitely ethical.⁽¹⁷⁾

This is based on the fact that she has not such a harmoniously balanced (cyclothyme) constitution. Her somewhat passionate nature appears to be controlled by her strong will. The result is permanent tension. She is always ready to feel intensively, and this tension⁽¹⁸⁾ spurs her on to act with energy and decision. Her character is not made for peace and enjoyment. She only receives real pleasure from things that have a certain elevating influence. Pathos⁽²⁰⁾, not passion, is her highest form of happiness. Her characteristic quality externally is not charm but gravity, and severity.⁽²¹⁾ She is not so much at one with herself as her husband; she is often at war with herself, feels drawn in opposing directions,⁽²²⁾ and sometimes indeed disheartened. She asks much of herself and is rarely contented with her own personality. She is assiduous, industrious, steadfast and methodical. She is constant in her feelings⁽²³⁾ and does not change so much as her husband. On the other hand she is not so broadminded and many sided.⁽²⁴⁾

She is very intelligent, has intellectual needs and capabilities,

which, however, she employs in educating and elevating herself. She does not enjoy intellectual pursuits so much, but rather looks upon them as the means of elevation.⁽²⁵⁾ She is, however, most practically minded. She places practical action before the merely intellectual. She has a great sense of responsibility both towards herself and others, and is certainly more sympathetic to others and more ready to help them in their troubles, than her husband.⁽²⁶⁾

A number of special traits result from this greater reserve, tension and restricted viewpoint.

Never internally harmonious and at one with herself, she is more easily wounded on certain occasions.

She has finer and more intensive feelings than her husband, and she does not take all sorts of worries so lightly as he. She cannot abandon or get over things easily that have made a deep impression, but she is neither small-souled nor childish enough readily to take offence, to bear a grudge, or to sulk. She differentiates clearly between essentials and non-essentials. She is broad-minded as far as the latter are concerned, but she remains fixed and adamant in things that appear essential to her. She possesses the qualities necessary for this, powers of criticism and observation,⁽²⁷⁾ in a high degree.

Faced with such contrary characters the reader will ask himself how such a marriage could have come about. What will their life together be like?

Naturally more caution must be exercised in giving an opinion here than in dealing with personal characteristics. Very often external reasons or chance play a great part in such decisions. In addition to this the possibilities of combination are always too varied for it to be possible to come to a definite conclusion judging from the characters of husband and wife alone.

Nevertheless, we have before us two such strongly defined, and by their very contrast, excellent characters for our purpose, that a certain amount may be said with some assurance about their life together.

It is highly probable that the somewhat older man ⁽²⁸⁾ made a very strong impression on the relatively young girl by reason of his talent, breadth of vision, and the high ideals he may have developed in her with regard to life and their future. A busy life based on breadth and beauty opened up for her. On the other hand, a man such as I have described above felt himself attracted by the seriousness and genuineness of the girl, especially as these qualities were associated with a considerable gift for enthusiasm. For, as has already been said, he most certainly has a feeling for all genuine things and has all the more respect for them because self-sacrifice, energy and courage are their bases—qualities he feels he lacks in himself and therefore admires greatly in his heart of hearts.

Thus these two fundamentally different characters supplement one another at first, and though later on they become somewhat critical, but not "unhappy," they will lead a very full life alternating between harmony and conflict.

As far as the purely sexual life is concerned it is obvious that it is not the dominant motive in either. In the wife her naturally strong emotions are thrust in the background by her ethical conceptions and tendency to self-denial, although these emotions could not be called in any way "repressed." In the case of the man all his impulses work themselves out to a great extent in a sublimated form, in æsthetic pleasures and companionship. Married fidelity may be presupposed both in husband and wife in the narrow meaning of the words. On the other hand, his need of companionship and his attraction for the feminine sex (being the more sensitive of the two) do not influence unfavourably his fidelity as a husband, for these desires are based on his general dominant needs (to impress!). Naturally more cannot be said about this point, though many other things may be concluded fairly certainly from the handwriting.

Thus quarrels will frequently arise whenever the woman reproaches her husband for some act of frivolity, inconsistency or extravagance.

Her deeper character makes it probable that she will soon experience a certain disappointment in the man she respected so highly at first—until, with the years, she learns, on the one hand, to appreciate his nature more justly and not to judge it by the ordinary standards, and on the other hand, has come to understand that perfect married happiness is a rare exception.

The husband, for his part, will be displeased at some of her points of view. He will feel that his comfort and his indolent ways are being disturbed, and at times he will feel misjudged and misunderstood. Thus he may at times leave her and turn to other people, only to see how much sincerity and fidelity he possesses in his wife and become aware, to a greater degree than previously, of many of his weaknesses and frivolities. On the other hand, she will always find new interests in his breadth of vision and natural talents and will admire the genial activity of all his efforts all the more because this has been denied to her by nature.

Thus we have before us a marriage that, although it is of fairly common occurrence and typical, in that the man is the more indolent (*and* more versatile) and the woman the stronger (although the more constricted) element, is nevertheless, considering each for the persons on their own merits, on a higher level than those usually encountered.

To 0.: Particularly marked in the handwriting by the cross lines with their points and angles. Shown in the large I and F, especially in the Ich and Ihnen (line 2).

To 1: Demonstrates primarily the dominant dynamic force of the writing (rapidity and sureness of the hand). Receptivity is shown by the rounded impression of the whole and the need to impress others by the over-emphasis of the first part of the letter. Enthusiasm for the matter in hand shown in the general fullness of the writing (also in the small letters).

To 2: Compare the forceful and energetic beginning of all the words with the decreasing power at the end.

To 3 : This is shown in the irregularity of the handwriting alone and by the size and shape of the letters.

To 4 : The same thing.

To 5 : Demonstrated by the "form-level" of the handwriting (a characteristic of the whole "make-up" of the writing which cannot be more closely defined) which shows the "level" of the writer, here fairly positive.

To 6 : The "upper part" of the handwriting, the "higher, mental edifice" in man, is far more prominent than the "lower part."

To 7 : The preliminary strokes and the other curves show the dominant æsthetic ideas, whereas the musical nature would be expressed in other forms than those pleasing to the eye.

To 8 : This and sensuous enjoyment are demonstrated chiefly by the fecundity of the handwriting, and by the breadth of the strokes.

To 9 : May be seen by the combination with all the other lines, particularly in those that follow.

To 10 : Shown by the capacity to give full play to the linking up of letters in the writing, which is indeed just as frequently crossed by the opposite and supplementary capacity to have ever had intuitions, demonstrated in the many "fresh starts" in words and parts of words ; an alternation, therefore, between closely associated and strongly dissociated parts.

To 11 : Such self-sufficiency is principally expressed in the backward tilt of the letters (for example, in the "u" in line 7), which alternate with the simple attention to the matter in hand ; further in the flourishes encircling the capitals and in the rounded beginnings to the words as in line 2 (line) line 7 (have).

To 12 : May be concluded from the combination of a number of lines, but principally from the whole "make-up," bearing the stamp in the writing of combining everything together.

To 13 : Shown in the imperious initial strokes to many letters (beginning to lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7).

To 14 : Compare the initial curves of the capitals I and L. Again, the fulness of the handwriting (roundness, etc.).

To 15 : General impression of the handwriting, "form-level."

To 17 : Dominance of the vertical strokes in the writing. Tendency to regularity, which is very largely successful.

To 18 : Pointed shape of the long letters, also shown in the small letters.

To 19 : Relatively large, at times alternating differences in length.

To 20 : Relatively high small letters (m, u, etc.) associated with narrowness.

To 21 : Whole impression more pointed than rounded. Simple unaffected beginnings to the words and capitals.

To 22 : Angularity, narrowness, and irregularity in the height of the small letters ; clumsy formation of many of the capitals (D, line 1, H, line 2, W, line 4).

To 23 : Narrowness and heaviness of the writing.

To 24 : Very little formation of the single strokes.

To 25 : " Under part " of the writing more noticeable than the " upper part " (particularly the small f's in lines 2, 3 and 4).

To 26 : To be concluded indirectly.

To 27 : Compare the fine " t-crosses," particularly in line 3.

To 28 : Such information regarding age, sex, and profession must naturally be placed at the disposal of the graphologist

(Signed)

GRAPHOLOGICAL INSTITUTE, CORNELIUS,
MUNICH.

CHAPTER XIV

INSIGHT AND ADAPTABILITY

IF I wished to attempt to discuss everything in this book that might be said about "Marriage and Character," I should, in spite of the lack of scientific data, still have to devote several long chapters to the subject. Further, if I made "reasoned choice in marriage" the principal theme of my book, I would not only have to make considerable additions to what I have already said, and cite and describe a number of qualities, particularly of a morbid nature, which prevent marriage, but also include a more or less detailed examination of Eugenics.¹

If I did either of these things—and why should I deal with the one more than with the other?—and proceeded to examine in detail still further characteristics associated with marriage, this, the second part of my trilogy, would have to be composed of several volumes, and those to whom the book is chiefly addressed, would not read it.

I am already afraid that a number of people who have read this book rapidly or superficially, in order to find advice in the prevention of hostility in marriage, have passed over certain of the previous chapters in the belief that (having already made the irrevocable choice) they do not contain matter of sufficient importance affecting their particular cases.

I would advise such people carefully again to read the chapters they have missed, for they are, however improbable this may sound, far more important for married people than for those to whom the choice still lies open.

Even an infinitely more detailed and convincing exposition than has been possible in this book, would have entirely

¹ *Eugenics* means the cultivation of conditions that will tend to improve the qualities of future generations.

failed to induce men and women to take every essential factor into account in making their choice in marriage.

Even if a person is clever or wise enough to choose that path to marriage, called by *Hegel*¹ "the most moral," he will not have been able to take all the points, suggested by reason, into consideration.

If, in spite of this, he still attempts to carry the affair through, he will be like the man looking for the "perfect" house who, finally, tired out with the search, returns to his old, inconvenient home, having failed to find a house facing south all ways.

However seriously marriage is regarded beforehand, it is highly probable that a time will come when it will have to be admitted: "I woke up one morning and found myself married."² To put it more clearly: a person will realize, generally after a certain time has passed, what marriage *really means* to him, and, at the same time, will see if his heart has been guided by his head in his choice.

If such is the case, he will indeed be fortunate. He will run little risk of having to employ most of his powers in preventing married hostility. Often, at such a time, he will remember with gratitude the advice given in the previous chapters which has helped him to make the right choice.

But he, too, may be considered happy who has failed to make the right choice and has to combat difficulties in his marriage, if he feels he has gradually gained insight into the nature of his task (and this can never come too late); an insight which he *should* have had before marriage. For, without the feeling of such support, he is lost. If he possesses it, the prospects of ultimate victory are good, and he may be able, especially if his wife, too, has acquired the necessary

¹ *Hegel* has said that the most moral path to marriage is where the resolve to marry is previously present, resulting later in inclination, so that both are combined in wedlock.

I was glad to read this, for it was so in my case, and such a procedure is, no doubt, very widespread.

The phrase "to go a-wooing" is the popular way of expressing this. It does not mean "to be in love" or "engaged," but only to be resolved and ready to marry." (Thomas Mann in *Keyserlings* "Book of Marriage.")

² *Byron* once said: "One morning, I awoke, and found myself famous."

insight, to make his marriage a good one, in spite of all obstacles.

Even if insight, based on knowledge and thought, can only enhance the possibilities of success in choice in marriage, but never make such success absolutely certain, this quality is an essential condition (at any rate, to a certain extent) of the success of the attempts of the partners to establish, or restore and maintain harmonious marriage.

Therefore, I may say that those chapters devoted to the choice of a partner are even more important to people who are already married than to those whose choice is still free.

Most married couples lack insight and understanding, and these deficiencies are the cause of many unhappy marriages. To help the man, whose task it is to lay the foundations of marriage, to gain this insight into the physiological basis of marriage (the erotic relationship between the married pair) was the purpose of my former book, "Ideal Marriage." For in our society, the man, as a husband, has neither the necessary knowledge, nor does he realize the importance of such things.

I have endeavoured, in the first part of this volume, to give insight into the circumstances and qualities, generally impersonal, that separate masculine and feminine from one another, and cause difficulties in the conjugal relations between man and woman.

My real purpose in writing the preceding chapters of this second volume was to give married couples, and those about to be married, an idea of (and, consequently, insight into) the importance of marriage to them and to show there what are the personal qualities and circumstances that influence married happiness in a positive or negative manner. I have, therefore, varied somewhat my earlier method, particularly because such insight has to be achieved by the reader for himself.

Insight into the real nature of marriage ; insight into the hearts of men and women and, thus, recognition of their

natural relationships; self-knowledge and knowledge of the partner. Insight such as this may be purely intuitive and its possession, in this sense, bestows a primary *aptitude* for marriage. There is no doubt that this quality, generally speaking, is more commonly found in women than in men, and is more developed in women.

The reason for this is patent, if we consider what has been said here about the nature of woman.

But, it is also true that this primary *aptitude* for marriage is often lacking, or has no opportunity of displaying itself, because it is driven into the background by purely selfish motives, and is, indeed, in the great majority of cases, entirely suppressed.

The fact that such motives are general nowadays among people of all classes, and are especially noticeable among women, appears to me to be responsible, in no small degree, for the "marriage crisis" about which there is so much concern. Such motives make it impossible for the aptitude for marriage to make itself felt.

Nevertheless, where such aptitude is dormant, it must be awakened; where it is deficient, it must be developed; in other words, knowledge, based on understanding and reflection, should arouse or replace intuitive insight, so that what may be termed a "secondary aptitude" may strengthen or act as a substitute for the primary. I have chosen these words to make it clear that insight, based on understanding and reflection, should not take on the character of conscious knowledge. Its task is to form the foundations of the disposition. The sphere of the near-consciousness (or the deeper layers of the subconscious mind) must be impregnated with this "Acquired" intuition, so that it is always present without, on that account, having to be termed "knowledge" on all occasions. Knowledge is of great importance, but it is not all. The basic disposition—insight—in conjunction with knowledge and reflection, is of far more value.

I have already explained in such detail those factors, an understanding of which is necessary if the necessary insight

is to be obtained, that it would be purposeless to say the same things over again in other words. To give a list of all the points that make for harmony in marriage and those that create discord, and to appeal to my readers to do this and avoid that, in order to prevent hostility in marriage, would be, in my opinion, to underestimate their intelligence. Again, must I explain, after all I have already said, that, in marriage, one case is radically different from the other? What is good for some is injurious for others?—I think this is superfluous. I shall, therefore, confine myself to emphasizing certain main principles in what I have written previously, and connect them with a short consideration of other matters that have not yet been dealt with.

The first is—although it cannot always be there in the beginning—*insight into the nature of marriage* itself. This must be rightly understood; insight into the nature of marriage, from the social and ecclesiastical point of view, is of relatively small importance, as far as the prevention of hostility in marriage is concerned. A more or less abstract philosophical insight is of little more significance; that is to say, it may, on occasions, benefit individuals, but is of no use to the average person. It does not come within his compass, and, even if he learns a little of this, it will be of no use to him in practice. What, however, will help, the average man to conduct and keep his marriage on the right lines, is the practical conviction, based on experience, that marriage, in its nature, is a union of two persons in one, in which both partners must play their parts. They must be prepared to sacrifice their personal desires and inclination, if the success of this “organism of a higher nature” is thereby endangered, finding, in this success, their own happiness. Naturally, human selfishness always struggles against putting this conviction into practice. This is well enough known by experience. But those who take marriage seriously will crush such feelings, will keep ever before them this conviction, and will develop their insight, making it stronger and stronger with an ever-increasing influence on their actions.

Further, a point which must be considered as being of importance, indeed of primary importance for the average man and woman, is the fact that *marriage* (apart from the advantages it offers in other respects, particularly as far as the joy of children is concerned) *is a necessary fulfilment in life of the personality*. Because it combines satisfaction of the gregarious and the sexual impulses. Therefore they must be convinced that it is better, far better, to live in marriage than to have remained single, even in cases where marriage brings with it many difficulties and troubles.

And, finally, with this knowledge and insight into the nature of marriage, comes the conviction that marriage is *a life partnership "for better, for worse—till death us do part."*¹ This means that, if the other binding ties are threatened with dissolution, the "sacred *must*" dominates the situation; and the married pair, whose good feeling towards each other has suffered from time to time, are kept on the right path, are impelled to make allowances for each other, and adapt themselves to one another. They summon up all their goodwill, and endeavour to fight married hostility by every means in their power.

This conviction, which should always be uppermost; this insight, which cannot be too deeply impressed, has helped many a marriage over difficult times and has made it possible for the vanishing happiness to be regained.

It is impossible for me to enter here upon the very complicated question of *divorce*. Indeed, there is no need for this, for divorce is no remedy for married hostility. On the contrary, it signifies the final victory of hostility.

It is, however, of importance to consider somewhat more closely the effect of *thoughts about divorce*, on the relationships between husband and wife. In my opinion, this effect can only be injurious, because such thoughts, particularly if of frequent recurrence, give a strong impulse towards separation, and place obstacles in the way of the wholesome influence of the "sacred *must*." Even if it is admitted that the feeling of being "chained to one another" is revolting to some persons, and must thus injure the good

¹ From the Marriage Vow of the Church of England.

relationships ; although I know as well as anyone else that there are cases in which divorce is the only way out of a situation that has become intolerable, and pity those to whom this outlet is denied—it does not alter my opinion that those persons who regard marriage as an indissoluble bond have, generally speaking, far more successful marriages to their credit than those who believe in the modern individualistic point of view that divorce must be made increasingly easy.

In any case, as long as the prevention of hostility in a marriage can be considered, any idea of a dissolution must be entirely left out of account.

Insight into the nature of man and woman in their natural relationship cannot fail, if it is true insight, to lead to a situation in marriage as described by *St. Augustine* (Aph. XXX.): “*uxor marito dominanti subsequetur*” (the wife allows herself to be guided by the husband).

There is no need for my women readers, lacking insight (or, for the sake of politeness—of another opinion), to say here, that this “long outworn saying” not only shows how hopelessly old-fashioned and reactionary the man who cites it is, but also shows that the writer *is* a man, and, as such, “naturally takes the side of his own sex.” Do not refer me to “F. M. Marriages,” for my reply will be that such marriages (quite apart from the fact that their percentage is relatively small), even in the more or less favourable form discussed previously in this book, are only possible on the basis of a “*pax perversa*” associated with a “reversed” mental outlook.

No! I am not taking the side of the man, and, in any case, I am not thinking here either entirely or even mainly of *his* welfare. My purpose is far more to help women, for whom a “*pax recta*” in marriage is of far greater importance than for their husbands. Agreed, that it is the nature of man to dominate and lead. It is none the less certain that it is woman’s nature *to allow herself to be led*; her pleasure to feel the support of the other; her tranquillity to feel that she is secure in his protection.

I print the following short, but none the less significant, poem, by *Ilse Heye* to show that such merging of the woman's soul, such trust and such belief in the man of her choice, far from degrading the true woman in her own eyes, fills her, on the contrary, with pride when she sees the power that is born of this weakness :

" I believe in you !
Into your hands I gave my life—
My happiness I pledged with you—
I laid my sorrows upon you—
When the stars fail
And the seas cover the earth
To swallow up the land,
You will hear,
To bear up the tottering
And support the falling,
For my trust is your strength,
And my love, your victory ! "

The last two lines of this poem show an intuitive knowledge of such high significance that it would be a blessing for every marriage if woman possessed such insight. In fact, indeed, the wife's belief in her husband, in his judgment, his power and capabilities (which means, first and foremost, his work) is a primary incentive to him to try to be worthy of such a belief. It spurs him on to get the *very best possible* out of himself, for, in truth, *this trust* is his strength and his victory.

Do not think I have been led by this poem I have just quoted to make statements that might be termed " poetical." What I have said is not based on emotion but on practical experience. The facts *are* thus, just as the opposite is true : that lack of confidence in the capabilities of the husband, particularly lack of sympathy in his work, has a paralysing or at least obstructing influence, which a man can only overcome in living his own mental life, in this respect, apart from his wife. And this cannot be achieved without serious damage to the unity of the marriage. Unfortunately, very few women possess the highly developed intuitive insight expressed in *Ilse Heye's* poem ; or, if they have it, they very often let it lie dormant after the lyrical atmosphere of the honeymoon and the first period

of marriage is over. It is my belief that one of the best preventives against hostility in marriage is the renewal of this insight (or its awakening in the sense of the "secondary aptitude" mentioned above) by active and reasoning means towards this end.

There is no doubt that by no means every man possesses those gifts that induce his wife to repose in him such confidence and trust. But, nevertheless, she saw those qualities in him when she married him, if she was a "real" woman and made a natural choice. And, further, if she recognizes that the happiness of her marriage is the most important thing of all to her, she can make good his (relative) lack of those qualities, if she takes up an attitude towards herself and her husband of still believing in him—as if he really did possess those qualities of mind that she thought to find in him. For her pretended confidence—if it is placed in a man who is not definitely below the average—has just as good results on his efforts to be worthy of it, as a confidence based on a real state of things. Perhaps it is an even greater incentive.

Thus fiction, if there is enough will power behind it, may become reality within certain limits, both for him and for her, because her auto-suggestion will be strengthened by the success of her suggestion.

It should not be thought that what I have stated is again a fiction or a mere supposition. I know cases of this nature, though not many, in which a woman, by a systematic "pretending as if things were all right" made good the mistake she made in marrying a man beneath her level; and achieved the success above mentioned. I have even observed certain marriages in which the woman has been wise enough to repress a special gift she had that put her husband in the background, thereby creating more happiness for herself than her talent could ever have given her.

It is not necessary to explain that besides the intuitive or acquired insight into what will make for the prosperity of the marriage, a certain amount of self-control is necessary

in order to follow the precepts affecting the attitude in general resulting from this insight. Further, it will be recognized that this self-control must be associated with certain qualities of character and mental outlook.

This disposition is very often lacking, probably more often than intuitive insight, which is thus prevented from exercising its influence. This deficiency contributes, in my opinion, in no small degree to the internal "crisis of marriage." The cause of this deficiency is largely to be found in the influence of "pleasure seeking"; a desire that dominates the outlook of so many people at the present time. Further, another no less important cause of an entirely different nature is Feminism. Even although this movement has arisen for the most obvious and justifiable reasons; even if it has brought, or hopes to bring, an improvement in or complete removal of, intolerable conditions and laws affecting numerous unmarried women, the divorced, the really unhappily married, widows and, to a certain extent, those married women whose married life is unhappy for reasons of a special nature; even if Feminism has made it possible for these women to find satisfaction in life outside marriage—nevertheless, it produces, owing to many of its fundamental ideas and slogans, and because of the usual manner of speaking of most of its propagators, a state of mind, both in unmarried women and in married women susceptible to its influence, which is definitely opposed to the outlook dealt with above. I am, therefore, convinced that Feminism has a more or less unfavourable influence on the foundations of marriage, and on the mental disposition in many marriages.

Another phenomenon which aims at increasing the power of the woman, and has just as unfavourable an influence (if not more so) on the fundamental principles of marriage, is termed by me *Heräism*.¹

It is older than Feminism (although this movement has

¹ Derived from Hera, wife of Zeus, particularly in the attributes ascribed in England to the goddess: "The *Lady* of the House, Mistress, Queen, Female Ruler."

had forerunners that may be traced far back in history), and, further, its course may be followed through the centuries, which is a proof that it expresses a fairly regular inclination among certain groups of men and women living in courtly and social surroundings. A study tracing this inclination in its various forms in history and analysing it, would, particularly as far as the origin of this inclination in the man is concerned, bring to light a highly interesting connection and association of motives. As historical phenomena, I may mention the Courts of Love in Provence; the Minnesänger and other expressions of Teutonic knightly romance.

As long as Heräism is confined to a relatively small social sphere, and as long as its effects are compensated by the existing attitude to the married relationships, the phenomenon, even if expressed in its most extreme form from time to time (I recall to mind the "judgments" of a certain "Court of Love" and the behaviour of Kunigunde in Schiller's poem "The Glove"), would do little or no harm to marriage as a whole. It is quite a different matter, now that courtly manners, which found their expression in *Heräism*, have become tame and widespread because they are no longer confined to the knightly class; and since the time when heräistic manners and affectations have been taken up as a substitute for court life by an increasing number of people.

It has, however, chiefly become different because this (relative) democratization of Heräism has worked together with the ideas propagated by Feminism, to penetrate wider circles with the viewpoint that the "Lady" is a being on a higher plane and should be served and honoured as such by the man. This attitude of mind, which is further strengthened by the frivolous mentality so prevalent at the present time, is particularly well expressed in a phrase I once heard spoken by a woman, otherwise reasonable and, indeed, intelligent, but who had passed her life in "heräistic" surroundings. She said: "Among my friends, we don't really think much about men." Knowing, as I do, that, in addition to more or less insignificant men, a relatively large number of leading

personalities in every walk of life are found in these circles, while the women there are usually conspicuous for their elegance and nothing else, we need say no more to show how completely false is the mentality prevailing in those circles. The influence of such a dominance of women ¹ on the true foundations of marriage is all the more serious if the phenomenon is general, and still worse if those manners, which still exist in the circles referred to above, are entirely lacking.

There is no need to deal further with the consequences of Heräism as far as marriage is concerned. The results to the woman of such a misunderstanding of the mental attitude of the man (a misunderstanding because a passing phase is considered to be a permanent quality) are seen most clearly in *Thackeray's* phrase : " Men serve women kneeling ; when they rise, they go away."

It must not be imagined that women alone are to blame for this state of things.

The men who have not been able to prevent the development of such an unnatural relationship between the sexes are equally, if not more, responsible.

An explanation of their attitude—better, their lack of attitude—although not easy, is less difficult to find than an excuse. We shall not enter into such an explanation as it would be of no practical value at this stage. It will be sufficient for our purpose to refer the reader to *Anthony M. Ludovici's* book, " Man : An Indictment." ²

Ludovici does not spare men in this book, and says that men at the present time have become entirely subordinate to women not because the woman is more capable of commanding than she was some centuries ago, but because men have degraded themselves to degenerate lip-servers and no longer think or behave like *men*.

In this book *Ludovici* very often greatly exaggerates.

¹ See *Erwin Stransky's* interesting remarks on the psychology of women (" Medical Psychology, Borderland Conditions and Neuroses of Women " in " Handbook of Biology and Pathology in Women," by *Halban* and *Seitz*),

² Published by Constable & Co., Ltd., London.

Nevertheless, it is highly desirable, in the interests of the future of our civilization, that his appeal for a "renaissance of the Man," which an increasing number of leading and understanding men have made to their fellowmen, should not go unregarded. Such a renaissance would be of advantage to marriage.

For, quite apart from anything else, as long as women do not achieve the insight which is necessary concerning their relationships with men, and as long as the man does not behave like a real man, marriage will not prosper. Fortunately, however, this is the conviction of a great number of "ordinary" women.

Before submitting certain ideas on "insight" into one's own nature and into the nature of the partner, I must deal with an important factor concerning the peace, harmony and happiness of marriage—the children.

However important it may be, we can only devote a few sentences to the subject; first, because its (often) decisive importance in marriage has been adequately dealt with in "Ideal Marriage," and in this volume, and secondly, because the third part of this trilogy discusses fertility and sterility in marriage.¹

We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to the following remarks: *children* are not only the natural, but also (psychologically speaking) the necessary attribute of normal marriage. Married people who neglect this truth, will find out, sooner or later, the injurious consequences resulting from this neglect, both for their own mental balance and for the marriage. Sterility may be a source of hostility in marriage. It is, therefore, important to make every effort to prevent it, and, if it is found to be present, to call in the physician in time (that is to say, in this case, relatively soon, from a year and a half to three years after marriage). *Voluntary* sterility may, in time, lead to still greater hostility, and this must not be forgotten.

¹ "Fertility and Sterility in Marriage; their voluntary Promotion and Limitation," by *Th. van de Velde* (Wm. Heinemann (Medical Books), Ltd., London, 1931).

But, undesired pregnancy is the most likely cause of hostility, and this becomes certain if the wishes of the couple are at variance.

There is only one possible way to prevent the harmony of marriage from being disturbed by problems of this nature. This involves agreement, when possible, in regard to these desires, and, in any case, entire unanimity of attitude. Further, the married couple must recognize, if Nature is not to have free play, that the natural forces are particularly strong and exceptionally cunning in this matter ; and it is, therefore, fairly easy for all the desires and plans to fall to the ground.

The main point is, however, that husband and wife must be agreed. It must also be remembered that the man has no right to burden his wife with the consequences of *his* attitude, or of his indifference (whatever may be the result of this).

It is certain that parental love and the love of the children for their parents is a very strong bond indeed. It is no less certain that they and their education may lead to differences, and, therefore, in time, to acute hostility, or, and this is more general, to the strengthening of an already existing hostility between the parents, if they are not agreed in their outlook on life.

The only way in which the children and the problems connected with them can be made a source of strength, instead of separation, is to agree upon a fixed programme ; unless, of course, marriage is avoided when the points of view are strongly opposed, and considered as particularly hazardous as far as the children are concerned. If such agreement does not come of itself, it must be attained in time by means of insight. And all the water of the feministic stream of rhetoric cannot wash away the fact that it is far better for the marriage, and generally for the children too, if this agreement is reached under the man's guidance. The man, however, must know how to show his qualities of leadership, which does not mean that he should interfere in every detail of the education (on the contrary, these details are the natural task of the mother and not

of the father), but he should see that the broad outlines are maintained.

Finally I must emphasize that a common error which may have to be paid for by married hostility (and is often the sign of such hostility) is to put the relationship between the husband and wife below the relations between the parents and their children. A marriage that does not in itself contain its own object and justification, but rather in the children, bears in it the seeds of decay. And, curiously enough, it is not successful in doing the very thing it seeks above all: to educate the children to be happy men and women.

Can anyone really have "insight into himself and into the minds of the partner?" Apart from the fact that a man and a woman can never really understand one another, (unless, and then only up to a certain point, with the help of psycho-analysis), because their manner of thinking and feeling is quite different, we are faced with a difficulty which seems to have no solution: self-knowledge is the first step towards understanding of mankind and thus to the understanding of "another."

No man can consider himself purely objectively, and this is essential if we are to have *real* self-knowledge. *Goethe*, one of the best judges of mankind and of himself the world has ever seen, was faced with this difficulty. This is proved by his remarks: "Man only understands himself by studying others" and "Others know me better than I do myself." Nevertheless, he found a way out of this impasse. He says: "Therefore, as I grew older, I paid the greatest attention to those people I thought might know my character, in order that I might become clearer about myself and my inner life, regarding them as so many mirrors." This process, to put it shortly, is carried out as follows: "I can only know another if I know myself; another, however, is better able to know me, than I am myself, therefore, in order to know myself, I must see myself as others see me." The process will also be of use to the average man, provided that he has the opportunity of meeting others who have

sufficient knowledge of men to be able to judge his character aright.

As such an opportunity usually does not offer itself, why should not a trustworthy professional reader of character be called in to help? There is nothing to be said against this except that, at present, it is by no means easy to find such a person. But, in my opinion, matters in this respect will shortly improve. I must, however, warn my readers against superficiality, amateur philosophers, irresponsibility and blind belief in methods that have not been sufficiently tested.

There is another way leading to self-knowledge which is exceedingly thorough: to allow oneself to be analysed methodically. In one of *Walter Cohn's* excellent short essays published in the *Characterological Review*,¹ the author points out that the method mentioned above, quoted by him, which was recommended by *Goethe*, is none other than psycho-analysis. (*Freud*, too, used the comparison of the mirror.) It must be stated that this process, for reasons that cannot be given here, is not suitable for daily use, although it may be very successful in particular cases.²

In whatever way man has to seek to gain self-knowledge and understanding of others, one thing is certain, that to those who earnestly seek after this knowledge, the promise contained in *Goethe's* "Faust": "He who ever onward strives, to him is redemption possible"—he will most surely be freed from the danger of married hostility.

For he and she who do not shrink from the effort of learning to know and to understand each other as far as is possible, will certainly possess or acquire the prudence, insight, wisdom and tact to live with each other in the best possible way, and the power to adapt themselves to each other's peculiarities.

Insight into the nature and desires of the other, together with genuine goodwill to protect the marriage from the danger of hostility, to conquer the separating by the binding

¹ Editor, *M. v. Kreusch*, 4th year, No. 1, 1927.

² Those who desire to gain some knowledge of psycho-analysis and its importance, are recommended to read "Popular Psycho-analysis," by *Paul Federn* and *Heinrich Meng* (Hippokrates Verlag, Stuttgart, 1926).

influences, will achieve adaptability. To be able to adapt himself to the inevitable contrasts brought about by marriage (an intimate association of such heterogeneous elements as man and woman): adaptability to the weaknesses of the other and adaptability to existing circumstances.

Such adaptability generally comes more naturally to a woman than to a man. It is for this reason, in my opinion, that the woman bears the greatest share of the responsibility for the details of the continuation and the maintenance of the edifice of the marriage. This contention will appear a contradiction of what I said above: that the man must guide the marriage, but such a contradiction will only be apparent to superficial minds. The man, to continue the comparison of the edifice, is responsible for the plans and the direction of the whole as well as for the details of the substructure, (the practical erotic part), while the woman's task is the performing and maintenance of the superstructure.

Naturally, the man is jointly responsible for this and must take his fair share of the work.

Insight, adaptability and goodwill: where do these lead if not to love?—and what are they together, if not love? Love that seeketh not its own happiness but that of others. That love which passeth understanding. The love referred to by *St. Paul* who, after having spoken of all the gifts of intuition (prophecy), knowledge and faith given to mankind, says:

“But covet earnestly the best gifts and yet show I unto you a more excellent way.”¹

“Charity suffereth long and is kind; Charity envieth not; Charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up.

“Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil;

“Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth;

“Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things endureth all things.”²

¹ 1st Corinthians xii. 31.

² 1st Corinthians xiii. 4-7.

CHAPTER XV

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRACTICAL EROTIC KNOWLEDGE IN MARRIAGE

THOSE who have pondered over *St. Paul's* wonderful words, which he terms "love of one's neighbour," from a psychological point of view, must have been struck by the fact that they express, above all, the great desire to neutralize those feelings that antagonize human beings from one another.

"Charity suffereth long and is kind. . . . Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." . . . The attitude of mind which should form the foundations for the prevention and combating of hostility in marriage (equally the neutralization of antagonizing forces) could not have been better described.

Even although a marriage, based on feelings of love for one's neighbour, on insight and understanding, adaptability and goodwill, and on union and community of interests, may be a marriage without antagonism, even a harmonious marriage—it is still not a marriage in the full meaning of the word. It requires, in addition to all this, in addition to the love as described by *St. Paul*, *sexual love*. There is no true marriage without erotic love, and no ideal marriage unless the practice of sexual love approach perfection.

How often practical erotic knowledge and technique are lacking in marriage, and how, as a result of this deficiency in emotional outlets, love vanishes and dies, has been explained in "Ideal Marriage."

Just as in *this* book I am attempting to show how the separating forces may be checked, so, in the former volume, I showed how the binding forces might be strengthened. Such measures, applied in time, are far easier to carry out than those I have intended to explain in this book, and the

reason for this is, firstly, that the practical measures can be described with far greater accuracy and that they can be employed with far less sacrifice.

I knew, when I wrote "Ideal Marriage," that I had touched on the "sore point" of marriage. The reception that the book received from so many people has convinced me more than ever that defective erotic training may not only be the direct cause of hostility in marriage, but that, further, failure to obtain satisfaction either on the part of the man or (particularly) the woman, is the origin of numerous phenomena that have already been discussed in detail, and which (although in themselves not of a directly sexual nature) contribute very largely to the appearance of hostility.

I have been confirmed in this belief even more by letters I have received from a number of mental specialists than by the numerous written and verbal "*historiæ matrimonii*" (histories of marriages), which seem very often "*historiæ morbi*," I obtained from patients themselves. Mental specialists know just as well as gynæcologists the importance of a normal sexual life, in which the person obtains satisfaction necessary to physical well being. They know, far better than we, the fatal consequences of unsatisfied married sexual life to the mental equilibrium and mental health. Thus, it is obvious that they welcomed a book that showed men and women the way to a happy married life in this respect.

The importance of a perfected technique in erotic relations is, as far as the prevention of nervous disturbances is concerned, far greater than mere sexual satisfaction itself, however important this may be. Primarily, because the relationship between husband and wife may be greatly influenced by such disturbances, and the perfection of erotic technique may therefore, be termed a preventive of hostility in marriage.

From time to time man feels the need to "let himself go"; to live his life to the full. Such a desire has generally

a strong reaction on the sexual life. To pursue it outside marriage is hardly possible. Ethical and æsthetical concepts prevent this. This means that he is not only opposed by the external moral code laid down by society, but also, by those inner moral precepts which have always been characteristic of the human soul.¹

The mental conflict arising from this may lead to neurotic symptoms, which are sometimes of a serious character. The opportunity offered by "ideal marriage" for entire sexual satisfaction, and, from time to time, for giving the sexual passions their full rein without infringing the natural moral law, is of inestimable value in this respect.²

Great importance must be attached, as far as the inner life of the woman is concerned, to the perfection of the sexual side of marriage, particularly in regard to that side of her inner life that causes the woman to desire violent stimuli (*cf.* Chapter III.).

Although, naturally, her desire for experiencing emotion offered her in "the more perfect marriage" is not wholly satisfied by erotic sensations, because she demands other mental stimuli, nevertheless, her thirst for excitement is stilled *in* and *through* marriage. Thus, in cases in which the marriage is an "ideal one," there is no question of the emotional dissatisfaction so injurious to marriage, which compels the sexually unsatisfied woman more and more to seek fresh "pleasurable" stimuli outside the marriage and unpleasant (although none the less irritating) sensations within the confines of her conjugal relations. A normal woman with any desire to be unfaithful is prevented from carrying it into practice if her emotional needs are satisfied. A wise husband will do this and extend this by complying, to a reasonable extent, with his wife's desire for variety and diversion. For the woman is *faithful* to her husband owing to her feeling of dependence, caused by her sensitiveness and plasticity, to her wish to subordinate herself (negative

¹ See C. G. Jung's book, "The Unconscious in Normal and Pathological Mental Life," 3rd Ed., p. 42 (Rascher & Cie., Zürich, 1926).

² In contradistinction to the acquired, unnatural moral law of asceticism.

desire for power), to her maternal feelings and to her intuitive understanding of the significance of the sexual act and its results, and she is only inclined to become unfaithful because of her emotional nature.

If the demands made by the emotional nature are adequately fulfilled in the way described above, and if there is no reason to seek sexual satisfaction, lacking in the marriage, outside (for in "complete and ideal marriage," the erotic desires are fully satisfied), then those qualities, together with her moral and æsthetic feelings and her deep devotion to the man who has given her the "love life," are strong enough to suppress any thoughts of all this. Even if such a woman becomes infatuated with another man she will seek protection from her husband and will find her happiness again in the "complete marriage."

It is well that this is so, for, as *Gina Lombroso*, in her book ("Woman Face to Face with Life") rightly says: "Unfaithfulness in the woman involves a final break with the man, whom she can never learn to love again. However great the goodwill and kindness of the husband may be, her marriage will inevitably be ruined."

The best guarantee for the fidelity of the man, too, is provided by the perfection of the erotic pleasures afforded him by "complete and ideal marriage," because his love for his wife and the ties binding him to her have become as strong as it is possible to imagine by constant reciprocal erotic satisfaction, and because any fortuitous "adventure" that he may be tempted to have, in spite of love and duty, will only bring him disappointment.

The disappointment he feels after such an adventure may not be so great as that described by *Goethe* in his poem, "The Diary"¹ (which might be addressed to men about to marry as a "Human Document to Promote Married Fidelity," but it is, nevertheless, a real disappointment). This *cannot* be otherwise, because *complete* erotic satisfaction can only be enjoyed by a man and a woman who love one another (a love which includes body *and* psyche, soul *and*

¹ Published in 1880 (7th Ed.) by Hans Feller, at Carlsbad.

senses), and are used and adapted to each other from the point of view of sexual technique. Such conditions cannot exist in fortuitous connections.

Goethe dictated the "Diary," mentioned above, in 1810 to *Riemer* at Carlsbad. *Riemer* says, in his "Account of *Goethe*" (Vol. II., p. 622), that it tells in excellent verse the story of a love adventure in which sensuality is paralysed by thoughts of his true love.

In most of the editions of *Goethe's* works this poem is suppressed "for the sake of propriety." *L. Fraenkel* (Breslau)¹ drew my attention to this poem. The dedication is typical of its contents ;

" . . . aliam tenui ; sed jam cum gaudia adirem,
Admonuit dominæ deseruitque Venus.

" *Tibullus* I., 5, V. 39-40." ²

Fraenkel rightly characterises the poem in the following words : " It can be called a pæan in praise of married love, although it is apparently most lascivious, because it shows, in the true classical manner, the difference between married love and a passing fancy."

Masculine and feminine feelings are analysed in the Diary, and *Goethe* shows himself to be an excellent psychologist of sex.

The poet, owing to an accident to his coach, is forced to spend a night at a house in a village. The girl who brings him supper falls under the spell that the eyes of certain men cast over women. The affection becomes mutual and, at midnight, the girl, as yet untouched, is in the poet's arms. Morning comes, and she is as virginal as before, for thoughts of his wife, his true love, have prevented the poet from touching the girl.

¹ In his review of " Ideal Marriage " in " The Archives for Gynæcology and Constitutional Research," Vol. XIII. (1 and 2), edited by *Max Hirsch* (Kurt Kabitzsch, Leipzig, 1927).

² " I held another in my arms, and just as I was about to enjoy the pleasures of love, Venus betrayed me and recalled to my mind the picture of my true love."

Wer hat zur Kraft ihn wieder aufgestählt ?
 Als jenes Bild, das ihm auf ewig teuer,
 Mit dem er sich in Jugendlust vermählet :
 Dort leuchtet her ein frisch erquicklich Feuer,
 Und wie er erst in Ohnmacht sich gequälet,
 So wird nun hier dem Starken nicht geheuer.
 Er schaudert weg, vorsichtig, leise, leise
 Entzieht er sich dem holden Zauberkreise.

Sitzt, schreibt : " Ich nahte mich der heimischen Pforte,
 Entfernen wollten mich die letzten Stunden,
 Da hab ich nun am sonderbarsten Orte
 Mein treues Herz aufs neue dir verbunden.
 Zum Schlusse findest du geheime Worte :
Die Krankheit erst bewahret den Gesunden.
 Dies Büchlein soll dir manches Gute zeigen,
 Das beste nur muss ich zuletzt verschweigen."

Da kräht der Hahn, das Mädchen schnell entwindet
 Der Decke sich und wirft sich rasch ins Mieder.
 Und da sie sich so seltsam wiederfindet,
 So stutzt sie, blickt und schlägt die Augen nieder ;
 Und da sie ihm zum letztenmal verschwindet,
 Im Auge bleiben ihm die schönen Glieder.
 Das Posthorn tönt, er wirft sich in den Wagen
 Und lässt getrost sich zu der Liebsten tragen.

Und weil zuletzt bei jeder Dichtungsweise
 Moralien uns ernstlich fördern sollen,
 So will auch ich in so beliebtem Gleise
 Euch gern bekennen, was die Verse wollen :
 Wir stolpern wohl auf unsrer Lebensreise,
 Und doch vermögen in der Welt, der tollen,
 Zwei Hebel viel aufs irdische Getriebe :
 Sehr viel die *Pflicht*, unendlich mehr die *Liebe*.

Although, in fact, a number of men may be stopped from committing an act of infidelity by their sense of duty, experience teaches us that many men cannot withstand the charms of another woman unless love holds them back. But, if a man feels himself allied to his wife by ties of love based on perfect erotic technique, not only is it much more likely that he will withstand temptation, but also—and this is far more important—it is practically certain that his love will be strengthened rather than weakened by such an adventure. It is, then, the place of his *wife* to make atonement possible. *Gina Lombroso* says: "Instead of

storming and threatening (which embitters the man and does not make things better), the woman should try and look on his error with the indulgence, magnanimity and calm of a mother."

I know the reason why my woman readers who have no insight and not sufficient maternal feelings are indignant, is that there *are* two standards ; and I do not deny this for a moment. But, it is not *I* who judge man and woman by a different standard ; it is nature herself who has made the sexual act of far greater importance, both mentally and physically, to the woman.

Nevertheless, I must emphatically warn men from having such "love adventures." There is always a risk attached to them, for the consequences cannot be foreseen. For example, venereal diseases, pregnancy, the possibility of inflicting a mental wound on the wife, thereby endangering the man's own happiness. It must always be remembered that the moment an element of deceit is introduced, marriage is threatened. Further, a woman can always *feel* that her husband is being unfaithful, even though she may not actually *know*. It must also be borne in mind that the man takes a responsibility towards his "co-respondent," which may lead to many difficulties, and may put a number of vexatious burdens upon him. Imagine, further, the internal and external conflicts that may arise, and how injurious they are to peace of mind and work. Reflect how much there is to lose *in* the marriage, and how little, on the other hand, is to be gained. If all this is pondered over there will be no doubt about the result.

Every man should at least *think* over the matter, and it is in his own interests that I wrote the previous sentences. *When* he has understood this, he should try to make his marriage an "ideal" one. If this does not take place, naturally a certain amount of the advice I have given no longer applies. This is perfectly true. But I am right in saying "All the more reason to concentrate the erotic capacity in every sense of the words—in time, on the perfection of the

mental and technical and physical aspects of the marriage, so that in "the more perfect marriage" protection may be found against the tendency to soul-destroying infidelity.

We shall conclude this short exposition of the importance of a perfected erotic training for the prevention of hostility in marriage with a few definite remarks that, logically, should have been mentioned at the beginning; the more erotic technique approached perfection and the marriage the "ideal," the less the possibility of the appearance of primary sexual antagonism (genital aversion, see Chapter II.), and the less will be the danger of a transformation of the approach impulse (even temporarily) into erotic antagonism.

We cannot leave the subject without again touching upon the numerous points of advice given in the first Volume. I cannot repeat all of it again, and must, therefore, confine myself to asking the reader who has read both volumes to study a chapter again from time to time, if he really wishes the books to be of use to him in his marriage, until the whole matter has thoroughly penetrated his consciousness.

Nevertheless, I shall here emphasize certain points of special importance.

I warn men not to suppress their erotic feelings by all too great concentration on their work, and, further, never to stand upon their sexual *rights*.

I recall to women what has been said about the avoidance of non-erotic (indeed, anti-erotic) intimacy. I most emphatically advise both *not* to let themselves be deceived by such theories as those of *Marie Stopes* (see "Ideal Marriage," p. 202). The consequences of such theories lead to heräism of the most dangerous sort, which will, sooner or later, drive a *real man* into the arms of another, owing to his sexual dissatisfaction and to involuntary feelings of revolt.

I would remind both husband and wife, but more especially the husband, that complete accord must exist regarding the desired or undesired consequences of their sexual connection.

Many letters have reached me stating that the erotic marriage relationships described in "Ideal Marriage" are

impossible for many couples who cannot take on the responsibility of positive consequences of such a relationship. I quite understand the position of these people. I must, however, leave the discussion of this question, which is beset with peculiar difficulties from every point of view (and which, for this very reason, requires detailed treatment) to the third volume of this trilogy: "Fertility and Sterility in Marriage."

I will give another piece of advice to married couples regarding erotic relationships, which may be of use to them. The kiss—the Love Kiss on the mouth—is far too often neglected in most marriages, even if there is sexual harmony.

It is properly employed in the "love play" as the direct introduction and accompaniment of coitus; but in the course of time it loses more and more its importance as an expression of love in itself. It is replaced by the "customary kiss" given and received at stated times: on going out, coming home, rising in the morning, going to bed at night—given indifferently and received without thought.

In a marriage which is still based on sexual love, such kisses are to some extent wounding, for they betoken a considerable decrease in erotic interest.

My advice is: avoid "customary kisses" and make free use of the love kiss—indeed, make *it* the customary kiss. There is one proviso, however: do not always proceed to the sexual conclusion, particularly when you kiss after a temporary estrangement. This may wound a sensitive person. Apart from this, restraint, after such mild stimulus, produces that strongly erotic atmosphere which is the most effective remedy for hostility in marriage.

Actually, if there is one thing that cannot be emphasized strongly enough, it is that the perfection of erotic technique which is expressed in "Ideal Marriage" must not lead to the fulfilment of every sexual desire. A certain amount of erotic tension must remain.¹ Further, the highest form of

¹ Cf. "The Importance of Erotics in Marriage." ("Die Erotik in der Ehe," Benno Konegen, Stuttgart, 1928.)

physical fusion must never be degraded to "mere pleasure for pleasure's sake," but must always remain the means of expression of the fusion of two souls (although this may only be possible for the moment). Regarded and felt thus is the perfected erotic technique in "Ideal Marriage," a means (but then a sovereign means) of renewing the marriage tie in every physical connection.

CHAPTER XVI

TREATMENT

WE saw in the first part of this book that hostility in marriage is a "disease" to which everyone is more or less exposed. This "disease" in its milder forms is, so to speak, part of the normal development of the marriage organism, but is capable, in its more serious aspects, of destroying this organism. Finally, very often it causes real disease in the two individuals who together make up this organism. For this to take place it is not necessary that there should have been previous morbid conditions, either physical or mental, in the husband or wife.

It is obvious that the possibility of the appearance of the more serious forms of hostility, and the danger of grave complications during the "normal course of the illness," are much greater if conditions and motives other than those naturally present come into play.

I have often had to mention those exceptions to the ordinary conditions that influence marriage, because they are so common. Further, it is impossible to draw a definite dividing line between normal and abnormal. None the less, I have tried as far as possible to keep to my intention not to deal with genuinely morbid disturbances.

It is difficult enough already for the learned reader to understand the normal causes of hostility, and he usually requires all the mental powers he possesses for his marriage so as to keep this "normal hostility" permanently in check.

Thus, there can be no question of making the task of maintaining this control more difficult by diverting the thoughts of the reader to problems affecting individual morbid disturbances. Further, no one can gain the upper hand of these pathological factors without the physician's assistance, and it is the same whether they have arisen

independently of the marriage, or originated in and because of the marriage. The married couple can be given no better advice, both in regard to their own individual welfare and to the prosperity of the marriage, than to call in the physician if they are of the opinion that their marriage is becoming complicated by mental or physical disturbances.

It seems scarcely necessary to mention that the question whether difficulties in marriage are based on pathological disturbances, can by no means always be answered by those encountering the difficulties.

This, however, does no definite harm, because when married hostility has exceeded certain limits (which are different for each couple and for every individual) it is *always* advisable to seek advice.

In the first place, a physician's advice should be sought, who is able to give a correct diagnosis of the physical factors which may be of decisive importance for the marriage. In many cases the physician must be a gynæcologist, because the disturbance injuring healthy marriage relationships affects the specifically feminine organism. But, if he really desires to give valuable advice in affairs touching on marriage, he must rid himself of an attitude of mind that has long been prevalent among gynæcologists—one that takes only the sexual organs and their immediate surroundings into consideration and almost entirely neglects the influence exercised by the mind on these organs and their functions.

M. Walthard, P. Mathes, W. Liepmann, M. Hirsch and others have paved the way for a more correct point of view. The researches of these men, who have shown that many morbid symptoms appearing locally (in the sexual organs) can be traced to mental causes, has led to better treatment—to psychotherapy. Therefore the gynæcologist must never forget the influence of the psyche in diagnosing symptoms he may see in his practice.¹ On the other hand,

¹ Compare the chapter edited by *Fritz Wengraf*, "Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy in the Light of Modern Gynæcological Literature," in the third edition of *W. Stekel's* "Sexual Frigidity in the Woman." As the above is confined to a special subject, the works of certain British psychologists, notably *W. Dougall* ("An Outline of Psychology," 1923, and "An Outline of Abnormal Psychology," 1926, Methuen & Co., London), should be read to it in the framework of general considerations.

although this is obvious, he must also consider the influence exercised by the sexual organs on the psyche. In short, the modern gynæcologist must constantly bear in mind the *reciprocal effect* of the psyche and sexual organs—all the more, if he has before him a case of difficulties in marriage.

The marriage therapist must also have a thorough knowledge of the modern theory of the constitution (including the extensive section dealing with the internal secretions) if only because with such knowledge he may be able, in some individual cases, favourably to influence, by medical or surgical means, certain mental or physical peculiarities that are harmful to the married relations.

Above all things, however, the adviser in marriage difficulties must have a thorough psychotherapeutic training. Anyone who has observed the abnormalities of the emotional life, which may be the cause of, or may strengthen, hostility in marriage, will have been struck by their number and gravity.

The quotation alone of a number of the titles of *Wilhelm Stekel's* books (who in his "Disturbances of the Impulsive and Emotional Life" has dealt in such detail with so many of these disturbances that his works have been taken as authoritative by many modern psychiatrists) gives some impression of the gravity and number of the phenomena. This impression is confirmed by reading the works in question.¹

If it is desired to go more deeply into the matter (presuming, naturally, that the works of *Freud* have been studied), it is only necessary to read certain psycho-analytical books to see how inexhaustible are the sources of morbid hostility in marriage. It will at once be understood that it would have been quite irrational on my part to have made it my task in this book to trace these sources, or to discuss

¹ "Parapathic Diseases," "Nervous Conditions of Fear and their Treatment," "Masturbation and Homosexuality (Homosexual Neurosis)"; "Sexual Frigidity in Woman" (psychopathology of the feminine love-life), "Impotence in the Man" (mental disturbances of the masculine sexual function); "Psychosexual Infantilism" (psychical children's diseases in adults). All these books are published by Urban and Schwarzenberg, Vienna.

the treatment of morbid disturbances in married relationships.

In regard to the treatment of hostility in marriage by an adviser called in for the purpose, I shall, after what has been said above, confine myself to the following remarks :

Without taking a definite side in answering the question whether psychotherapy should be exclusively a matter for the physician, I believe it to be essential (having regard to the particular reciprocal effect existing between the mental and physical factors in many marriage difficulties) that mental treatment should be given here by the physician, or at least in permanent contact with him.

What methods should be applied is another question. Not every physician is capable of applying every type of mental treatment.

Personal disposition, experience, and tact and the mental "make-up" of the patient are the deciding factors. Neither *Freud's* nor *Alfred Adler's* theories should be over-rated, nor considered as applicable in every case. Not every patient has received a sexual trauma (scar), and not every one has *Adler's* "inferiority line." All schools of thought should be considered in such cases. The healing power does not come from the method, but from the physician applying it.

Just as in the selection of a drug, the right choice of the correct remedy at the right strength and at the right moment must be made. A combination of various methods may have particularly successful results.¹

It is thus clear how important it is for those seeking help and advice in their difficulties to find the right physician. But it is no less obvious how high are the claims made upon the doctor, not only as far as knowledge is concerned, but also in regard to character. With his sterling qualities, the old-fashioned family physician was second to none in this respect.

He proved himself a tower of strength in many marriages,

¹ Taken roughly from *Romheld*, "Psychotherapy of Internal Diseases," 39th Congress of the German Society for Internal Medicine, Wiesbaden, 1927.

where his task was to prevent the further progress of ever-increasing hostility.

His knowledge of men, his highly developed faculty of intuition, his experience of life, his human kindness, increasing as the years passed, his understanding, gained in the course of time of the qualities and circumstances of the married couple, placed him on an equal, indeed on a higher, footing than his grandson, the "marriage doctor" of to-day, with all his scientific knowledge.

Is there such a person as the "marriage doctor"? Perhaps, one may meet him by chance. But as yet such a special branch of medicine does not exist.

If it comes into being it should, in my opinion, be established by gynæcologists of mature years, familiar with the laws of the constitution and heredity, with sexology and with the normal and pathological psychology associated with this. These men should also have been trained in the application of psychotherapeutic methods (which, like operating, cannot be learned from books). Further, this special branch should comprise expert psychotherapists who have made a special study of the problems referred to (especially in general gynæcology), and who have practical experience in specialized gynæcology.

I must now mention two points which I consider to be of great importance for the "marriage doctor" and his patients.

Firstly, that wherever possible, he should advise and treat both the husband and wife; and secondly, that he should follow *Walthard's* psychotherapeutic conceptions (which are in agreement with *Dubois'* method of persuasion).¹ Even if he has entirely mastered and generally employs other methods (for example, psychoanalysis) he will find he will be successful in many cases if he proceeds according to *Dubois-Walthard*, that is to say, not by collecting the materials for conflict first of all, but by endeavouring, helped by his patient, to gain an understanding of the

¹ *M. Walthard, "Psychotherapy," Halban and Seitz's Handbook, Vol. II., 1924, p. 697.*

causes of the disease originating from the struggle between desires (impulses) and opposition.

"The patient is shown the necessity of changing her manner of thinking after she has been brought to see the whole situation clearly. She must be freed from egocentricity, and attain to a high degree of adaptability to any given circumstances."

This is not only the guiding idea of *Walthard's* mental treatment of individual morbid phenomena, it must be also the foundation of the therapeutic struggle against disease in marriage, either if outside help is summoned, or, as in the case of milder forms, if the treatment is carried out by the patient himself.

Another fundamental law of self-treatment of married hostility is that found in *Ovid's* well-known words (often quoted in the wrong sense) "*principis obsta*"; "be on your guard from the very beginning"—for, if the evil is already deep-rooted the healing draught comes too late.

Although the poet's advice is given in his "*Remedia Amoris*," Cures for Love, it is just as applicable as a means of *protecting* love by fighting the hostility. The great importance of more or less sudden *change* must be emphasized here.

All living things have a tendency to remain fixed in an existing position, and only a powerful stimulus can break this tendency, thereby creating a new position, bringing with it the involuntary desire again to remain fixed. Applied to relationships in marriage it means that it is of the greatest importance to maintain a tendency to remain fixed in married union by the deliberate avoidance of "points of irritability," and to prevent hostility from becoming permanent.

As a rapid, certain and pleasant remedy for warding off that danger, which may arise in an acute case of hostility, (for example, as a result of a more or less violent quarrel) I recommend those who have a sense of humour, or can acquire it, to employ it in their dealings with one another and to regard himself or herself from a somewhat ironical viewpoint. The remedy (provided it is not employed in the

reverse sense) correctly administered has an extraordinarily calmative effect, and prevents, in that it removes the critical tension present in such circumstances, what may be a very serious disadvantage to good married relationships.

The following are the principal methods for the self-treatment of married hostility: self-persuasion, based on insight, combined with a strengthening of the will to good and self-control; suggestion and auto-suggestion; wordless suggestion and the philosophy of "as if" applied to daily life.

I have no more to say regarding self-persuasion, based on insight, which I regard, together with the perfection of the erotic relations, as the most important remedy against, and as a most effective method of, treating hostility in marriage. The whole purpose of this book has been to give this insight and thus to promote self-persuasion.

We shall now discuss shortly the other methods, which are in practice closely associated with one another. If we were to consider all that might be said on this point and all that has already been said (although not from our point of view) this book would have to be extended not only by one, but by several volumes. We need only think of suggestion and auto-suggestion! We shall now examine somewhat more in detail the question of "wordless suggestion," which I hold to be of particular importance at this point.

It belongs to the sphere of telepathy, one of the "occult sciences," but is based on the most reliable proofs.

If there is anyone who doubts its reality and has not been convinced by the information published by research workers into the occult, he will be converted by reading the short report on the experimental investigations carried out by *Heymans*, *Brugmans* and *Weinberg*¹ at the Psychological Institute at Groningen.

Having regard to the fact that thought transference from one person to another without employing the usual means

¹ "Reports of the Association for the Study of Psychical Research," 1921, No. 9, Amsterdam.

of conveyance (words and signs) has been incontestably proved, we can (naturally with a great deal of caution) attach value to the experiences which everyone may have of this in daily life, if he puts his mind to it.

Indeed, unintentional thought transference (excluding what occurs by employing words or signs) without definite concentration, is so probable that it may be regarded as an accepted fact in conjunction with what has been definitely proved.

It is an experience of daily life, that if two people are together (particularly if their mentality is more or less attuned or at least, if they are accustomed to be with each other) the thoughts of one will suddenly be turned to a subject about which the other is thinking at that moment. Although it must at once be admitted that in such cases an involuntary word, a sound or a sign makes the connection, or that thoughts of the same nature may arise in both owing to association, originating in the same, conscious or unconsciously received stimuli—it is nevertheless highly probable that the whole phenomenon cannot in many cases be explained in this way, but is based on direct, “immediate” thought transference. Thus intentional, or unintentional suggestion, without the use of speech, is possible. Probably such suggestion plays a far greater part in life than is imagined.

The possibility of such suggestion can be proved without any great difficulty as often as is desired by experimental means, (although they may not be entirely exact) not only between human beings, but between a human being and an animal. I have myself had experience with regard to dogs, and in my opinion, observations on horses show this most clearly.

Although usually in such cases the contents of the conscious mind of the one is transferred to the near-consciousness of the other, and by this way is often carried further to his conscious mind, it is also possible and, indeed, probably often occurs, that the contents of the near-consciousness of the one person is transferred to the near-consciousness (limiting layer) of the other. *Karl Gruber*, the well-known

Munich para-psychologist, recently published some very interesting information about this subject, showing the influence of ideas arising in the near-consciousness of the mother, through reading, on the dreams of her children. Everyone, except those who refuse to believe, may conclude from these accurately described observations, and from other, far less detailed, but none the less convincing experiences of this nature, that, as a result of the close mental contact existing between husband and wife, good marriage relationships are threatened not only by "sinful thoughts" (*i.e.*, thoughts that stand in contradiction with married love), but also by mental under-currents arising from hostile ideas and attitude. Naturally, it is equally possible that the subconscious mind of one of the partners may be favourably influenced by the other. Many years ago I saw an example of this which I still consider as a convincing experiment. Some months after marriage a couple found themselves in a very difficult position. Business enemies, financial misfortune and internal conflicts had, mentally speaking, brought the man to a very low ebb. This appeared, naturally, in various nervous symptoms, the worst of which was insomnia and the excitement associated with it. His wife was the person that helped him to overcome his troubles. As she lay beside him in the darkness, motionless and silent, so that he thought she was asleep, she very often brought him release, peace and sleep by powerfully and continuously concentrating her thoughts, throughout a considerable period, on the ideas: "You must be calm; you must not think about things any more; You must sleep—I *will* you to sleep now." In the morning the husband almost thought that sleep had come to him in some miraculous way. She continued this procedure for seven or eight weeks, her sole thought being to help her husband, she herself being ignorant of the nature and significance of her action. By this means she made it possible for him to get over the worst period.

During the whole time the woman said nothing to her husband about the "treatment" she was giving him, and

thus it was not until later that he realized what she had done for him.

This reticence—which I consider to be an essential factor in achieving the desired result, because if the person on whom the experiment is made knows of it he is no longer natural and the effect is disturbed in various ways—such reticence may here be partially explained by the rather reserved character of the woman, but was also certainly based on intuitive understanding of what had to be done to achieve the success so greatly desired.

Further (this was shown in subsequent discussions), another element must be brought in to explain the case, which reflects so clearly the typically feminine manner of thinking and feeling that I cannot forebear to mention it, although it has really nothing to do with our subject. Very often we learn more from an example than from a treatise, and both husband and wife can learn from *this* example.

By reason of her feelings and reflections, this woman really knew what the relationship between man and wife naturally should be (harmony between the specific characteristics of the man and those of the woman), and therefore she tried—without being fully conscious of it—to conceal, both to herself and from her husband, the fact that it was *she* that had guided her husband during this period, so that, except during the hours of mental concentration, she did not wish to think, far less speak, about it.

Instinctively, the real woman refuses to see any weakness in the man she loves.

The following quotation taken from the woman's diary shows this attitude of mind so clearly that I leave it just as she wrote it :

“ In the man the moment of weakness, of desiring to lean on the woman is so tenuous, I might almost say so sacred, that it can never be referred to even between husband and wife. Such a complete surrender on the part of the man is—weakness ; and weakness means, as far as the woman is concerned, renunciation of what the woman instinctively seeks in the man : steadfastness, power, control and security.

“ If he surrenders himself the woman at first feels proud of his trust that is so great that he even shows her his weakness ; later on she feels pity, and finally self-pity, because he does not possess that dominating power which is her support.”

This, however, is not the place to sing a pæan on the “ Wonder of Wives,” or a paraphrase about the “ Marvel of Women.”

I shall only say that since the above case attracted my attention, I have, during the course of years, observed similar experiments or caused them to be carried out, and the results have firmly convinced me of the possibility and usefulness of such influences.

In some cases of married hostility in the first stages I have prescribed the employment of “ wordless suggestion ” as the most important part of the systematic self-treatment recommended to the married couple, and I can therefore advise others to make suitable use of it.

For some people a recommendation, accompanied by explanation, to concentrate their thoughts on the aim to be attained, is sufficient, while for others the learning by heart of a verse made up by themselves (the rhythm is all important here) similar to the *Coué* formula (“ From day to day, in every way, I am getting better and better ”) will be more applicable. The best time of the day for self-treatment by “ wordless suggestion ” of married hostility (which, at the same time, has a strongly auto-suggestive influence if, as it should be, it is of an altruistic nature) is just before going to sleep (or if there is difficulty in sleeping after this, the time just after awakening). The best place is the old-fashioned marriage bed, which, however its advantages and disadvantages are judged, and admitting its discomforts, promotes, owing to the physical proximity, this kind of thought transference.

Such a daily “ seance,” which should not be of too long a duration, should be concluded if possible by meditation on the objection in question. Thus we have again reached the question of self-persuasion.

“ The Philosophy of ‘ As-If,’ a System of the theoretical,

practical and religious fictions of mankind, based on Ideal Positivism," elaborated and proclaimed by *Hans Vaihinger*,¹ deals with the so-called "fictions," i.e., with those reactions of our thought that have the peculiarity of being untrue—consciously, purposely untrue—but which are valuable, and from a practical point of view necessary.

According to *Vaihinger*, thought must primarily be considered as a condition of life. In it are contained the elements of necessity and utility. It is not, as is generally supposed, a mirror reflecting unchanged a reality outside ourselves.

It is far rather a biological function, a means of finding direction in life with the object of maintaining and enriching this life. A means of making action possible and more simple, of coming to terms with reality and mastering it.² We must think in order to live.³ The "fictions" occupy a large place in this thought, for they comply in a high degree with the claims of necessity and utility mentioned above.

In marriage, too, we cannot go without this philosophy as expressed by *Vaihinger*, and we must therefore devote a large space to thinking and acting "as if" in the therapy (particularly in the self-treatment) of married hostility.⁴

¹ There are numerous books dealing with this philosophic system. Some of them have as their object the application of *Vaihinger's* theory to special sciences. *Vaihinger's* own great work contains certain sections (as is pointed out by *Reymund Schmidt* in the preface to the popular edition edited by him) that, although they show most clearly the scope of the fundamental principle to the expert, are of little or no significance for the layman, and, in addition, this hinders reading and understanding in that they interrupt the broad line of thought. Laymen are therefore recommended to read the abridged popular edition published by Felix Meiner (Leipzig, 1923), and *Vaihinger's* "The Origin of the 'As If' Philosophy" in Vol. II. of "Contemporary Philosophy," edited by *R. Schmidt*, and also published by F. Meiner (Leipzig); further, "Introduction to the 'As If' Philosophy," by *B. Fliesz* (Velhagen and Klasing, 1922). Books particularly for physicians are: *Richard Koch* "As If" from a Medical Standpoint" (*Rösl & Co.*, Munich, 1924), and *F. Rielti*, "The 'As-If' in Medicine" (*Giornale di psichiatria clinica e tecnica manicomiale*, 1923).

² Compare *A. Tilgher* "Relativisti Contemporanei," 4th Ed., Rome (Libreria di scienze e lettere, 1923). *MacDougall's* statements should be remembered in this connection.

³ *Fliesz* says: "We do not live to think, but we think to live."

⁴ For the sake of simplicity and brevity I do not distinguish between "fictions" and "semi-fictions," as also between "a behaviour as-if" and a behaviour based on "fictions." These distinctions are admirably explained by *Koch*, but they are of no great importance to our purpose.

Just as the physician, in order properly to fulfil his task, sometimes acts, in regard to something that is possible, as if it would in fact take place, and in regard to another matter that is uncertain, acts as if it were certain,¹ similarly in marriage we must often act as if man and woman *could* understand one another; as if perfect harmony *could* exist between them; and proceed from the "fiction" in this case from the supposition that the good intentions that both husband and wife *may* have, really do exist.

These "fictions" more or less correspond with those of *Vaihinger's*. We must, nevertheless, in the prevention of married hostility by self-treatment, as also in many similar conditions of life, often employ one or other of the methods of "acting as-if," which do or do not entirely comply with the demands made by the philosophic system, but which are based on an "as if" *theory of life*. This theory of life is far older than *Vaihinger's* philosophy, far older than the systems or methods of thought of his predecessors, (*Schiller, Kant, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Marchesini*). It is a theory that has been held at all periods of the world's history—that of *conscious and desired imagination*.

Imagination, auto-suggestion and suggestion, acting as if—there are the causes of many ills, and at the same time a sovereign remedy for many ills—not the least of which is married hostility!

"Fortis imaginatio generat casum, discent les clerics,"² wrote *Montaigne* in Chapter XX. of his *Essays* ("De la force de l'imagination"),³ and he proved this by many examples from the most ancient times.

We now say: Fiction may replace reality—and, becoming reality, be itself superfluous.

¹ Act as if every case of acute appendicitis would lead to perforation, and every perforation to a general peritonitis.

² "Strong imagination produces the event of itself, say the learned men."

³ "On The Power of the Imagination."

FINAL SURVEY

Every marriage is threatened with hostility between the partners, because in the relationships between the sexes, mutual repulsion exercises at least as powerful an influence as attraction, and because material and opportunity for conflict are abundantly present in the close conjugal association of such differently constituted beings as man and woman. On the other hand, marriage alone makes it possible for human beings to attain the complete and simultaneous satisfaction of various instincts and impulses that are most important in life. For this reason, and in spite of the difficulties only too often connected with it, I am firmly convinced that marriage must be regarded as an essential condition of life for men and women, a condition of life in this sense, that, although life outside marriage is quite possible it is not a *complete* life, and that life in a marriage which is only partially successful is preferable to an existence without a partner.

Moreover, if men and women understand how to overcome these difficulties, marriage offers so many and such important prospects of enlarging the scope of life in every or nearly every direction, that it more than compensates for the efforts, devotion and self-sacrifice demanded of husband and wife.

These devotions and self-sacrifice, however, are absolutely necessary. Without them married happiness is inconceivable. Indeed, devotion *is* readiness to make sacrifices. For devotion, only given on condition that it is reciprocated, is no devotion. Those who are not prepared to give true devotion, or are incapable of it, will *always* be disappointed in marriage.

But effort, constant and never relaxed, must also be there. All happiness must be acquired, and needs unceasing labour if it is to be maintained. This is essentially true of happiness in marriage. For marriage should not be accepted as an actual fact, but should be considered as an ideal which is gradually approached with much effort.

Thus understood, it cannot be denied that married hostility, as long as it is kept within certain limits, may perform a useful function. And to the inevitable dissonances (unless they are uncontrolled) in marriage an even more perfect solution can be found.

“ Partout, veiras que nais
L’armounio d’an tuert.”¹

A successful marriage will again and again reconcile its conflicts, and the true marriage is not the one without conflict, but the marriage that is ever reconciling its conflicts.²

“ True marriage ” and “ ideal marriage ” finally lead to the
Perfection of marriage.

¹ “ You will see everywhere how harmony comes out of strife.”

² The motto on title page, that characterizes the intention of this volume.

EPILOGUE

EVEN books have their history. Most books, indeed, have a prelude, the story of their beginnings and development. I take this opportunity of making the following remarks about this, the second volume of my trilogy.

For years I had included in my scheme of work the writing of a book, which although conceived on strictly scientific lines would, nevertheless, appeal not only to the physician but also to the intelligent reading public. The purpose of that book was to consider, from a technical point of view, the problems associated with fertility in marriage. For practical experience had taught me how many couples needed such enlightenment, and how many physicians would be glad of such a book for reference purposes.

When I at last found time to proceed to carry out my plan, I at once saw that it would be necessary to precede my statements on these problems by a comprehensive introduction. The object of this introduction was to impart certain knowledge regarding the sexual physiology of man and woman, and at the same time to give a physiological and technical account of sexual relationships in marriage. Only those possessing such knowledge could really understand the discussion of the factors affecting fertility in marriage.

But as there were no books that gave sufficient information on these subjects, I had to write one myself. I did so, all the more because I was convinced that a thorough explanation of sexual relations and their technique would be of great value to many of those who were already married (and to numerous physicians as well). The result of this was "Ideal Marriage." The good reception given to this book, both by physicians and the general public, judged from the criticisms and the numerous letters I received, showed me that I had planned aright.

It became increasingly clear to me while writing the volume dealing with physiology (resulting from my own reflections, and also of verbal and written exchanges of ideas with physicians, psychologists and moralists) that it would have to be followed by another, treating of married happiness and its maintenance from another aspect : the psychological.

This was necessary to prevent the superficial reader from over-estimating one factor, which might lead him to *under*-estimate others equally important.

Again, it had to be done to protect the author from the unjustified reproach of one-sidedness, which otherwise might have been raised by such readers of " Ideal Marriage." But above all it followed from the statement emphasised in my introduction, that the marriage bond should be made secure not only by strengthening the attractive, but also by combating the repelling forces.

These were the reasons that led me to write the present volume.

The criticisms of the first book, which have appeared subsequently, have further convinced me that I was justified. In addition to the general appreciation of " Ideal Marriage," which has afforded me unalloyed pleasure, the opinion was expressed by certain of the critics that " the book urgently required a sequel dealing with the ethical and psychological side of the problem."

As I have already remarked, neurologists in particular welcomed the first volume with genuine enthusiasm. This need occasion no surprise, for they, most of all, see the unhappy results of defective or incorrect sexual technique in marriage, caused by ignorance. That they, too, have welcomed the announcement of the appearance of this second volume cannot surprise us.

On the other hand, it is quite understandable that certain psychotherapeutic specialists have expressed their doubts about the boldness of the undertaking for an author who has had no special training in this branch of medicine.

While I was writing this volume I was advised by followers of various psychological and psychotherapeutic schools to

base my statements on the ideas and experience of one definite theory or another. But however great might be the services to science and to practical knowledge rendered by these schools, I did not desire to bind myself to any one theory—either generally or particularly. Instead I have followed the principle of taking the good where I find it, and have thus borrowed from any theory that appeared useful to my work. I have attempted to summarise all this for the benefit of the reader and to make him understand the matter.

In employing this method of procedure, I naturally run the risk of being attacked not only by the followers of "other" theories, but also of being told by experts of *every* school that I am an "outsider" with no knowledge of psychology in general, nor of the psychology of marriage in particular.

This was already done in anticipation, as will be seen from the following extract (otherwise friendly and appreciative) taken from *Fritz Wittel's* review of "Ideal Marriage," which appeared in the "Neue Freie Presse," Vienna: "*Van de Velde* speaks of the technique of marriage. He announces the publication of two further volumes dealing with psychology and children (an expression which may give rise to misunderstanding!). It is probable that they will never be written. If he had known enough about the psychology of marriage, he would never have written about the technique of marriage. 'Ideal marriage' comes with its own technique, given the correct psychological conditions. These are, however, so complicated that experts have tried in vain to disentangle them."

Yes—if the arrangements of practical life had to wait until the "thinkers" and "philosophers" had finished "thinking" and "philosophising" and until the "learned men" had ceased to try *in vain* to disentangle the psychological conditions of "ideal marriage," the ordinary man would gain just as little assistance as he would if physicians held up their prescriptions and intervention until the theorists and research workers at their writing tables and in their laboratories had disentangled the no less complicated problems

dealing with the diseases of the body. This naturally does not imply that I do not value very highly the work done by the thinker, the philosopher, the psychologist, the theorist and the laboratory research worker.

In any case "I shall do my duty, come what may." I believed it to be my duty to write the present volume, and I hope that I have helped at least a few—if possible, a number—of my fellow-beings to gain sufficient insight into themselves and their partners (but, above all, into the meaning of the "two in one" which is, or *should* be, marriage) to enable them to combat successfully the married hostility that threatens them.



h. Coppel, pinx.

B. Picar, sculp.


1. Don Quixote defeats Samson Carasco.



2. Don Juan.



3. Chrysale.



4. Youthful Figure with well-defined Sexual Differentiation.
(After *Mathes*, taken from *Halban and Seitz's "Handbook of Gynæcology."*)



Musée Condé, Chantilly.

5. *Raphael's The Three Graces*



6. JAVANESE WOMAN.

From *C. H. Stratz's* book: "The Beauty
of the Feminine Body."



7. From *C. H. Stratz's* book : "The Beauty of the Feminine Body."




8. From *C. H. Stratz's* book : "The Beauty of the Feminine Body."



G. Riebcke, Charlottenburg.

9. Woman holding the Spear.

(Photographed in a modern School for Physical Training.)



G. Riebcke, Charlottenburg.

10. Young Girl, Sixteen Years.

(Photographed in a modern School for Physical Training.)




11. From *Ploss-Bartel's "Woman."*
(Wm. Heinemann (Medical Books), Ltd., London.)



Musée du Louvre, Paris.

12. *Holbein's Anne of Cleves.*



Stadelsches Institut, Frankfurt a/M.

13. *Perugino's Madonna and Child.*



Musée du Louvre, Paris.

14. *Perugino's Madonna and Two Saints.*



Cambio, Perugia.

15. *Perugino, by himself*



16 Young Man (British).



17. Young Man (British).



Goethe National Museum, Weimar.

18. Charles Augustus walking in the Park.



19. Goethe's Mother.




20. Pycnic-syntonic Woman (Dutch).



21. The same woman as a girl of eighteen.

(This photograph shows in comparison with No. 20 how difficult it may be to recognize the pycnic formation in a face of a young girl; nevertheless, the shield form of this face, although not so broad, is fairly characteristic.



23. 24. Intersexual Schizothyme (after *Mathes*, from *Halban and Seitz's*
"Handbook of Gynæcology").




Uffizi, Florence

25. Botticelli's "The Birth of Venus."




Palazzo Schifanoia, Ferrara.

26. *Francesco del Cossa's "Triumph of Venus."* Fragment showing the Three Graces.




Musée du Louvre, Paris

27. *Memling's John the Baptist and Mary Magdalene.*




Picture Gallery, Weenen.

28. *Memling's Eve and Adam.*



RECEIVED



30. *Fritz Klimsch's "Charis" (from W. von Bode's
"Fritz Klimsch").*



31. From Hagemann's School for Physical Training.



32. From *C. H. Stratz's* book.



33. Two English Girls, showing true feminine characteristics with middle mixed forms, making nevertheless a leptosome general impression.



34. From *Hans Surén's* "Man and the Sun."



35. From *Hans Surén's* "Man and the Sun."



6. From *Hans Surén's* "Man and the Sun."



37. From *Hans Surén's* "Man and the Sun."



38. *Van Dyck's Charles I. of England.*

NAWAB SALAH JUNG SAHADUR.



39. 40. 41. Portraits of Mummies found at Fayeûm.
(From "The Woman in Ancient Art," by *M. Ahrem.*)



Goethe National Museum, Weimar.

42. Princess Amalia von Gallitzin,
née Countess von Schmettau.

